

National Defense and the Limiting of Naval Armament

Congressional Digest

Washington, D. C.

VOLUME IV

January, 1925

NUMBER 4

The Work of Congress, December 20—January 20

Special Order of Business

Congress Day by Day

Action on President's Recommendations

Calendar of Legislative Action

National Defense and the Limiting of Naval Armament

Chronology of Events in U. S. Naval History

The Navy Today: Policy - Organization - Activities

The Limitation of Armament Treaty and Naval Legislation in the 68th Congress

The Naval Controversy—Pro and Con Discussion

By Members of Congress, Naval Experts, Peace Organizations

Additional Features

Notes on the Constitution—The First Ten Amendments

United States Supreme Court Decisions

Government Bulletins Reviewed

50c a Copy

Published the fourth Saturday of every month

\$5.00 a Year

The Congressional Digest

Not an Official Organ, Not Controlled by Nor Under the Influence of Any Party, Interest, Class or Sect

Published the Fourth Saturday of Every Month. Alice Gram Robinson, Editor and Publisher
Current Subscription Rates: \$5.00 a Year, Postpaid in U. S.; in Canada \$5.25; Foreign Rates \$5.50
Current Numbers 50c a copy, Back Numbers 75c a copy; Volumes, Bound \$10 each; Unbound, \$7.50
Address orders to: The Congressional Digest, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

Copyright, 1925, by Alice Gram Robinson, Washington, D. C.
Entered as Second-Class Matter September 26th, 1911, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C. Under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Contents of this Number

	PAGE
The Work of Congress, December 15, 1924 to January 20, 1925	
Special Order of Business.....	111
Action on President's Recommendations to 68th Congress, 2nd Session.....	112
Calendar of Legislative Action.....	114
Congress Day by Day.....	116
National Defense and the Limiting of Naval Armament	
Chronology of Events in U. S. Naval History.....	118
The United States Navy Today	
U. S. Naval Policy.....	119
The Fleet and Its Auxiliary Craft.....	119
The Mission of the Marine Corps.....	120
The Purpose of the Naval Reserve.....	120
The Naval Duties of the Merchant Marine.....	121
The United States Naval Academy.....	121
Peace Time Activities of the U. S. Navy.....	122
A Glossary of Naval Terms.....	123
The Naval Controversy	
The Limitation of Arms Treaty and Naval Legislation in the 68th Congress.....	124
Text of H. R. 8687 Authorizing Alteration and Construction of Naval Vessels.....	125
Digest of Provisions of Treaty for Limitation of Naval Armaments.....	125
Table Showing Relative Naval Strength of Treaty Powers.....	125
President Coolidge Outlines Administration's Naval Policy.....	126
Secretary Wilbur Reviews the Naval Situation.....	126
Is Our Navy up to Full Treaty Strength? Hon. Burton L. French <i>vs.</i> Hon. W. N. Rogers.....	127
The Question of Gun Elevation. Hon. Fred A. Britten <i>vs.</i> Hon. Thos. S. Butler.....	128
Does the Passage of H. R. 8687 Start New Race in Armament? Hon. James V. McClintic, Hon. Ralph F. Lozier <i>vs.</i> Hon. Philip D. Swing.....	129
Do We Need a Strong Navy to Accomplish Further Naval Reduction Among Nations? Hon. Carl Vinson, Capt. Luke McNamee <i>vs.</i> Hon. Edward W. Pou.....	130
Should the U. S. Navy Stand Still Though Other Navies are Increased? Hon. Henry B. Steagall <i>vs.</i> Walter Bruce Howe.....	131
Should the Treaty Ratio Be Maintained Ship for Ship? Rear-Admiral W. L. Rodgers <i>vs.</i> Frederick J. Libby.....	132
Did the U. S. Benefit by the Washington Conference? Raymond Leslie Buell <i>vs.</i> Capt. Dudley W. Knox.....	133
Does Increasing the Navy Incite War? Jesse H. Holmes <i>vs.</i> Mrs. Noble N. Potts, Captain E. H. Campbell.....	134
Does Preparedness Prevent War? Capt. Wm. H. Standley <i>vs.</i> Mrs. Robert M. LaFollette.....	135
Does a Weak Navy Invite Aggression? Capt. W. S. Pye <i>vs.</i> Lucia Ames Mead.....	136
Other Features	
Notes on the Constitution—The First Ten Amendments: "Our Bill of Rights".....	137
Recent Government Publications of General Interest.....	138
The Supreme Court of the United States: Recent Decisions.....	139

The Congressional Digest

Volume IV

January, 1925

Number 4

The Sixty-eighth Congress

Duration of the 68th Congress, March 4, 1923—March 4, 1925.
First, or "Long" Session, Convened Dec. 3, 1923, Adjourned June 7, 1924.
Second, or "Short" Session, Convened Dec. 1, 1924, Expires March 4, 1925.

In the Senate

96 members

51 Republicans
2 Farmer-Labor

42 Democrats
1 Vacancy (Conn.)

Presiding Officer

Albert B. Cummins, Iowa, Republican

Floor Leaders

Majority Leader
Charles Curtis, Kans., R.

Minority Leader
Joseph T. Robinson, Ark., D.

Party Whips

Republican
Wesley L. Jones, Wash.

Democratic
Peter G. Gerry, R. I.

In the House

435 members

222 Republicans
1 Socialist
1 Independent

208 Democrats
1 Farmer-Labor
2 Vacancies (Cal.; Ill.)

Presiding Officer

Speaker Frederick H. Gillett of Mass., Republican

Floor Leaders

Majority Leader
Nicholas Longworth, Ohio, R.

Minority Leader
Finis J. Garrett, Tenn., D.

Party Whips

Republican
Albert H. Vestal, Ind.

Democratic
William A. Oldfield, Ark.

The Work of Congress, December 20 - January 20

Special Order of Business

Action on President's Recommendations

Calendar of Legislative Action

Congress Day by Day

Special Order of Business

SUCH satisfactory progress has been made by both houses in advancing the annual appropriation measures which are the chief order of business for the short session that it has not been necessary to call a joint meeting of the Republican Steering Committees of the Senate and House. According to the schedule, the appropriation bills are expected to have passed both houses by the first of February, which will leave the month of February for conference work on them. The status of the appropriation bills on January 20 was as follows:

The House had passed the Second Deficiency for 1924, the appropriations for Interior, Agriculture, Navy, Treasury and Post Office, War, and the First Deficiency for 1925. All of these with the exception of Navy and War had passed the Senate. Both houses have agreed to the Conference reports on the Second Deficiency for 1924, the Treasury and Post Office bill, and the First Deficiency for 1925.

The House now has before it appropriations for Independent Offices and for State, Justice, Commerce and Labor, leaving the District of Columbia bill, the Second Deficiency for 1925, and appropriations for the Legislative Establishment, which are scheduled to reach the House from the Appropriations Committee in the order named.

Action by the House on the Howell-Barkley bill to abolish the Railroad Labor Board (H. R. 7358) which was scheduled to be called up as the special order of business on January 5 was again deferred. Mr. Barkley, author of the bill, announced to the House that his bill would not be pressed because there was a fair chance of a compromise measure receiving favorable action in the Senate soon. The companion bill in the Senate (S. 2646, Howell, Nebr., R.) was reported by the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce with amendments on June 6, and is pending on the Senate Calendar.

The Senate disposed of the Muscle Shoals bill by passing the Underwood substitute amendment. When it reached the House it was ordered to lie on the table for the decision of the Republican leaders as to the next step to be taken. The bill may be sent to the House Military Affairs Committee, where it will encounter the majority which last year reported out the Ford offer. It is understood that proponents of the Ford offer, which was passed by the House last session by a vote of 227 to 142, are opposed to the Underwood substitute. It will not be a simple task, therefore, to bring the substitute within a majority vote off the House. The most likely action to be taken, is to send the bill to conference, where the difference between the views

of the Senate and the House might be reconciled. The question of the appointment of the conferees then arises as the determining factor in the fate of the bill. It is customary for the conferees in each house to be appointed by the Chair. It is also customary to appoint conferees who are friendly to the bill as it passed the body. It is also customary to appoint as one of the conferees the chairman of the committee which handled the bill, and to consult him in regard to the other conferees. In this case, Senator Norris, chairman of the Senate committee handling the bill, is opposed to the bill as it passed the body, which leaves an uncertain situation as to conferees in the Senate. The situation is somewhat the same in the House, although it is understood that the House committee is agreeable to finding some solution to the Muscle Shoals problem, and is willing to consider the possibility of the Underwood substitute as a final solution.

The unfinished business of the Senate sitting in open executive session is the Isle of Pines Treaty, which is expected to be disposed of before the end of the week. It is obliged to go to a vote, and although the opponents of the Treaty claim to have 4 votes to defeat it, the vote is expected to be very close. The Navy bill which continues to be the unfinished business of the Senate proper is also expected to be disposed of before the end of the week.

By a two-thirds vote of the Senate, the new postal pay increase bill (S. 3674) which was reported to the Senate on January 2, 1925, was made the special order of business in the Senate for Thursday, January 22. It is probable that some definite action will be taken on the bill, although it can be displaced from its position by a majority vote.

The next special order of business in the Senate will be one of the bills listed on the Steering Committee program. One of these, the "McFadden banking bill," (H. R. 8887) which was passed by the House on January 14, 1925, under a special rule, is expected to have favorable action by the Senate. The bill as it passed the house is practically the same as the Pepper bill (S. 3316) which is pending on the Senate Calendar. Any differences will probably be taken care of by the Senate committee before the McFadden bill is reported to the Senate.

An effort will be made to secure favorable action on the bill for the reorganization of the executive departments of the government. The bill (S. 3445, Smoot, Utah, R.) was reported by the Special Joint Committee on Reorganization of Executive Departments last June and carries the support of President Coolidge.

Action taken on the Republican Steering Committee program in the Senate since last month is as follows:

On December 30, 1925, the Senate passed S. 3173 (Fernald, Me., R.) providing for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River from a point near the Lincoln Memorial in the City of Washington to an appropriate point in the State of Virginia. On January 3 the bill was referred to the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, where hearings were held on January 14. The bill as it passed the Senate authorized an appropriation of \$14,750,000.

Action has also been taken on H. R. 2869, S. 2060, and S. 2061. See action on President's Recommendations under *Judiciary*, page 113.

Action Taken on President's Recommendations to Sixty-eighth Congress, Second Session

The President's recommendations for legislative action contained in his second annual message of December 3, 1924, to the 68th Congress, were printed in the December, 1924 number of *THE CONGRESSIONAL DIGEST*, p. 77. The bills cited below embody the President's recommendations in whole or in part, but have not been specifically endorsed by the President unless indicated. The following report includes only those recommendations on which Congress has acted during the period December 20, 1924, to January 20, 1925. Action on these recommendations is reported in this Department month by month.

Waterways

On January 14, 1925, public hearings on the bill (H. R. 3933, Winslow, Mass., R.) for the purchase by the Government of the Cape Cod Canal property, were closed by the Senate Committee on Commerce. The full committee will consider the bill on January 22.

On January 15, 1925, the Senate by a vote of 179 to 6 passed the Rivers and Harbors bill (H. R. 11472), carrying a total of approximately \$39,000,000 and authorizing expenditures for improvements on 35 projects. The measure represents a compromise between the Rivers and Harbors Committee and administration leaders to comply with President Coolidge's economy program, and is approximately \$13,000,000 less than the \$52,000,000 bill (H. R. 10894) which was reported in December and which this bill supersedes. The bill is now before the Senate Committee on Commerce.

The Senate Select Committee on the Nine-foot Channel from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, of which Mr. McCormick, Ill., R., is chairman, and which held hearings during the 67th Congress on S. 4428, held further hearings from January 13 to 16, and resumed the hearings on January

20, 1925, on the proposed project for a waterway from the Lakes to the Gulf. The Select Committee is expected to make its report within the next two weeks.

Agriculture

On January 14, 1925, the President's Agricultural Conference submitted to the President its first report which covers the emergency in the live stock industry. The report contained two recommendations for action by the Federal Farm Loan Board, which will not require legislative action. The Conference also recommended that the Agricultural Credits Act be amended by eliminating the provision that prohibits the rediscounting by Federal Intermediate Credit Banks of loans negotiated by Federally chartered agricultural credit agencies. The abandonment by the Government of the policy of allowing free and unrestricted grazing on the unappropriated Public Domain and the substitution of a system of grazing under lease was also recommended.

The next report of the Conference will cover cooperative marketing of farm products.

The first deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 11308) for the fiscal year 1925 carries an item of \$50,000 requested by the President for expenses of the Agricultural Conference.

Muscle Shoals

On January 14, 1925, the Senate by a vote of 46 to 33 adopted the Underwood substitute amendment for the House bill (H. R. 518) to accept the Ford offer for Muscle Shoals. The bill has been before the Senate since December 3. The measure can be sent direct to conference or can be referred to the House Military Affairs Committee which originally reported the bill in the House. On January 17, 1924, Mr. McKenzie, chairman of Military Affairs Committee and author of the original bill (H. R. 518), objected to the Senate amendments and asked unanimous consent to send the bill to conference but withdrew the request when Mr. Longworth, floor leader, asked that the bill remain on the Speaker's table for a few days. It is understood that the conferees have unlimited jurisdiction with regard to this bill and could bring in a bill entirely different from the present measure.

The bill as passed by the House last session provided for the acceptance of the Ford offer for Muscle Shoals which was withdrawn by Mr. Ford on October 15, 1924.

The Underwood substitute amendment for the bill authorizes the President to lease the Muscle Shoals plant for fifty years under certain guarantees, and regulations. In case the President is unable to lease under the terms of the bill before September 1, 1925, the bill authorizes the President to establish an Organization Committee of five persons to set up a Government Corporation to take over the Muscle Shoals plant and operate it in accordance with the provisions of the bill.

Railways

On January 9, 13 and 14, 1925, the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce held hearings on the Cummins bill (S. 2224) which provides for permissive consolidation of the railroads during a period of years, after which the government may take action. The Committee expects to resume hearings on January 21.

Shipping

On January 5, 1925, Mr. Jones, Washington, R., Chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, introduced a bill (S. 3836) to amend the Merchant Marine act of 1920, and the Shipping act of 1916 to conform to the suggestions made by President Coolidge for separation of the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation. The measure also contains other provisions designed to effect modifications of the shipping policy. The bill is before the Senate Committee on Commerce for action. A companion bill (H. R. 11309) was introduced in the House on the same day by Mr. Lehlbach, N. J., R., and is before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Judiciary

On January 6, 1925, the House Judiciary Committee reported the bill (H. R. 8206, Graham, Pa., R.) to amend the Judicial Code, further to define the jurisdiction of the circuit courts of appeals and of the Supreme Court, etc. The bill which is a companion measure to the Senate bill (S. 2060) is now pending on the House Calendar.

On December 17, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary held hearings on the bill (S. 2061, Cummins, Ia., R.) to give the Supreme Court of the United States authority to make and publish rules in common-law actions. This bill which was pending on the Senate Calendar was recommended to the Committee on December 12.

Prison Reform

The bill (H. R. 2869, Foster, O., R.) to establish a U. S. industrial reformatory for young men was passed in the Senate December 30, and approved by the President January 7, Public Law No. 305.

District of Columbia

Subcommittees of the House and Senate Committees on the District of Columbia are considering jointly the bills H. R. 8464, (Reed, W. Va., D.) and S. 3017, (Ball, Del., R.) to establish a Board of Public Welfare in the District of Columbia in order to facilitate action on these measures. On January 21, 1925, there will be a joint meeting of the Committees.

Reorganization

Mr. Smoot announced to the Senate on December 30 that he had that day received a letter from the White House asking that the bill (S. 3445) to provide for the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government, be taken up at an early date and passed so that it may become a law at the present session of Congress. In the House the companion bill (H. R. 9629) is pending on the House Calendar. Both measures were reported to the Congress last June by the special Joint Committee for Reorganization of the Government Departments.

Army and Navy

A special subcommittee of the House Military Affairs Committee has been appointed under the chairmanship of Mr. Hill, Md., R., to take care of the following measures providing for the military status and for appropriate recognition of the services of the world flyers: H. R. 10522, Winslow, Mass., R.; H. R. 10386 and H. J. Res. 303, Rathbone, Ill., R. The Secretary of War appeared before the committee and made recommendations relating to the legislation proposed. The subcommittee will draft a bill which will incorporate in one bill the provisions of the several measures and will report it to the full committee for action.

On January 15, 1925, Mr. Winslow, Chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reintroduced his bill (H. R. 10522) to encourage and regulate the navigation of civil air craft, etc., with certain modifications and changes as H. R. 11667, to create a bureau of civil air navigation in the Department of Commerce. On January 16 the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce ordered to be reported out the Senate bill (S. 76, Wadsworth, N. Y., R.) to create a bureau of aeronautics in the Department of Commerce, etc. As amended in Committee the Senate measure carries practically all the provisions of the Winslow bill (H. R. 11667).

See special feature, page 124, for Navy legislation.

International Court

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee will consider the Swanson resolution (S. Res. 220) proposing adherence by the United States to the Permanent Court of International Justice on January 21, 1925. The resolution (S. Res. 234) introduced by Mr. Pepper, Pa., R., was reported by the Committee May 27, and is pending on the Senate Calendar. A discussion of the respective Pepper and Swanson resolutions was printed in the June, 1924, number of THE CONGRESSIONAL DIGEST.

Foreign Debt

On January 17, 1925, the House passed the bill (H. R. 9804, Crisp, Ga.) to extend the term of the World War Foreign Debt Commission for two years. A companion bill (S. 3493, Smoot, Utah, R.) was passed by the Senate on December 16, 1924.

On December 22, 1924, the President approved the bills (H. R. 10650) authorizing the settlement of the indebtedness of Lithuania to the United States (Public Law No. 298), and (H. R. 10651) authorizing the settlement of the Polish debt to the United States (Public Law No. 299).

Calendar of Legislative Action

A Classified List of All Legislative Measures of National Interest Receiving Action in Congress From December 16, 1924 to January 15, 1925, Inclusive

Unless bills introduced at this session have had action subsequent to their introduction they have not been listed because of the limited time during a "short" session for consideration of new measures. The new bills will be listed below if action is taken by the Committees to which they were referred.

Editor's Note:

1. *The title:* The titles as listed do not cover the full scope of the bill but indicate its general subject matter. "Similar Measures" deal with the same subjects, though the provisions may vary.

2. *The Action Taken:* All legislation is subject to the following action in Congress: a measure must first be introduced; second, referred to a Committee; third, reported from the Committee, favorably or unfavorably, with or without Committee amendment; fourth, voted upon by the House and by the Senate, approved or vetoed by the President.

3. *The Number:* Every legislative measure introduced in either House is given a number for identification. The abbreviations used are as follows: House of Representatives Bills—H. R.; House Joint Resolutions—H. J. Res.; House Concurrent Resolutions—H. Con. Res.; House Resolutions—H. Res. Senate Bills—S.; Senate Joint Resolutions—S. J. Res.; Senate Concurrent Resolutions—S. Con. Res.; Senate Resolutions—S. Res.

4. *The Author:* The name of the Representative or Senator introducing the bill or resolution is given, followed by his state and politics (Republican—R.; Democrat—D.).

For Key to Committee abbreviations see full list of Senate and House Committees in December, 1923 number, page 76.

The names of the Senate and House Committees to which the measures are referred when introduced, are used as the subject headings under which the bills are classified below. The Senate measures are listed first, followed by the House measures.

Senate Measures

Agriculture and Forestry Committee

To designate route of old Oregon Trail. Amended and passed Dec. 30; S. 2053; McNary, Ore., R.

To establish Alaska Game Commission, etc. Passed H. Jan. 5; S. 2559; Norbeck, S. D., R.

To amend act authorizing Dir. of Census to collect and publish cotton statistics. Passed Dec. 30; Reptd. to H. Clms. Com. Jan. 3; S. 3530; Smith, S. C., D.

For control and eradication of poultry disease. Passed Dec. 19; S. J. Res. 159; amended and passed H. Dec. 20; McNary, Ore., R. Approved Dec. 24; Pub. Res. No. 41.

Appropriations Committee

To extend apprn. re Columbia Basin investigation. Passed Dec. 19; Amended and passed H. Dec. 20; S. J. Res. 157; Jones, Wash., R. Approved Dec. 22; Pub. Res. No. 40.

Banking and Currency Committee

To amend Fedl. Farm Loan Act and Agric. Credits Act of 1923. Reptd. Jan. 13; S. 3632; Fletcher, Fla., D.

Commerce Committee

To amend act granting addtl. quarantine powers, etc., upon Marine Hospital Service. Reptd. by H. Interst. and Forn. Com. Com. Jan. 13; S. 2232; Jones, Wash., R.

To convey certain lands to Duluth, Minn. Reptd. by H. Mer. Mar. and Fishs. Com. Jan. 10; S. 3123; Shipstead, Minn., Farmer-Labor.

District of Columbia Committee

To prescribe method of capital punishment in D. C. Passed H. Jan. 12; S. 387; Dial, S. C., D.

For exam. and registration of architects in D. C. Approved Dec. 13; S. 933; Ball, Del., R. Pub. Law No. 295.

To amend act making apprn. for expenses of D. C., etc. Reptd. by H. D. C. Com. Jan. 15; S. 1786; Ball, Del., R.

For compulsory school attendance, and school census in D. C. Passed Dec. 30; Reftd. to H. D. C. Com. Jan. 3; S. 2842; Capper, Kans., R.

Finance Committee

To refund taxes paid on certain distilled spirits. Passed Dec. 30; Reftd. to H. Ways and Means Com. Jan. 3; S. 3072; Stanley, Ky., D.

To amend secs. 2 and 5 of Act of Mar. 4, 1923, to give official status to customs reprs. abroad. Passed Dec. 30; Reftd. to H. Ways and Means Com. Jan. 3; S. 3357; Edge, N. J., R.

To extend life of World War Foreign Debt Commission. Reptd. Dec. 16 and passed; S. 3493; Smoot, Utah, R.

Foreign Relations Committee

For indemnity to Swedish Govt. for fishing boat *Lilly*. Passed Dec. 30; Reftd. to H. Clms. Com. Jan. 3; S. 2458; Lodge, Mass., R.

To pay indemnity to British Govt. rel. to steamship *Baron Bervick*. Reptd. by H. Clms. Com. Jan. 12; S. 2719; Lodge, Mass., R.

Indian Affairs Committee

To provide for disposition of bonuses, rentals, etc., recd. under Act of Feb. 25, 1920, to promote mining of coal, etc. on public domain. Passed Dec. 30; Reftd. to H. Ind. Affrs. Com. Jan. 3; S. 876; Spencer, Mo., R.

To authorize expenditure for certain purposes of receipts from oil and

gas on Navajo Indian Resvn. in Ariz. and N. M. Passed Dec. 30; Reftd. to H. Ind. Affrs. Com. Jan. 3; S. 1653; Harreld, Okla., R.

To facilitate suppression of intoxicating liquor traffic among Indians. Passed Dec. 30; Reftd. to H. Jucdy. Com. Jan. 3; S. 2375; Harreld, Okla., R.

For expenditure of tribal funds for repair, rental, etc., of agency bldgs. Passed Dec. 30; Recalled from H. for reconsideration Jan. 3; S. 2838; Harreld, Okla., R.

To amend law rel. to timber operations on Menominee Resvn., Wis. Passed Dec. 30; Reftd. to H. Ind. Affrs. Com. Jan. 3; S. 3036; Harreld, Okla., R.

To confer jurisdiction upon Court of Claims, notwithstanding lapse of time, etc. to hear certain Indian claims. Amended and passed Dec. 30; Reftd. to H. Ind. Affrs. Com. Jan. 3; S. 3346; Frazier, N. D., R.

Irrigation and Reclamation Committee

Granting consent of Congress to La Plata River Compact. Reptd. by H. Irrig. and Recl. Com. Jan. 6; S. 1656; Bursum, N. M., R.

To provide for aided and directed settlement on Govt. land in Fedl. irrigation projects. Com. dischgd. and bill postponed Dec. 30; S. 3605; Kendrick, Wyo., D.

Judiciary Committee

To provide for addtl. Deputy Coroners in D. C. Approved Dec. 13; S. 116; Ball, Del., R. Pub. Law No. 294.

To establish probation system in U. S. Courts except in D. C. Reftd. to H. Jucdy. Com. Jan. 2; S. 1042; Copeland, N. Y., D.

To provide fees to be charged by clerks of distr. courts of U. S. Passed Dec. 30; Reftd. to H. Jucdy. Com. Jan. 3; S. 2173; Pepper, Pa., R.

For accounting by clerks of U. S. Distr. Courts of fees in naturalization proceedings. Passed Dec. 30; Reftd. to H. Jucdy. Com. Jan. 3; S. 2174; Pepper, Pa., R.

For accounting of fines, fees, etc., paid to clerks of U. S. courts. Passed Dec. 30; Reftd. to H. Jucdy. Com. Jan. 3; S. 2175; Pepper, Pa., R.

U. S. court clerks to prepare indices of judgment debtors under decrees or orders of courts, to be open to inspection. Passed Dec. 30; Reftd. to H. Jucdy. Com. Jan. 3; S. 2176; Pepper, Pa., R.

For disposition of bribe moneys used as evidence, etc. Passed Dec. 30; S. 2177; Pepper, Pa., R.

For rendition of accounts by U. S. Attys., marshals, clerks of U. S. courts, etc. Passed Dec. 30; Reftd. to H. Jucdy. Com. Jan. 3; S. 2179; Pepper, Pa., R.

To amend Penal Code rel. to loss of civil rights on conviction of felony. Amended and passed Dec. 30; Reftd. to H. Jucdy. Com. Jan. 3; S. 2691; Walsh, Mont., D.

Requesting consent of Congress to boundary agreement between New York and Conn. Passed H. Jan. 5; S. 3058; Brandegee, Conn., R. Approved Jan. 10.

To amend sec. 558 of D. C. Code re notaries public. Passed Dec. 30; Reftd. to H. Jucdy. Com. Jan. 2; S. 3392; Ball, Del., R.

To change terms of distr. court in S. C. Reptd. and passed Dec. 16; Reftd. to H. Jucdy. Com. Dec. 19; Reptd. Jan. 15; S. 3509; Dial, S. C., D.

To enlarge powers of Washington Hospital for Foundlings. Reptd. and passed Jan. 5; S. 3733; Cummins, Ia., R.

To change times for holding U. S. courts in So. dist. of Iowa. Reptd. and passed Jan. 5; Reftd. to H. Jucdy. Com. Jan. 6; Reptd. Jan. 8; S. 3792; Cummins, Ia., R.

Senate Measures—continued

Library Committee

To accept gift of Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge for music auditorium in Library of Congress. Reptd. in H. Dec. 20; S. J. Res. 152; Pepper, Pa., R.

Military Affairs Committee

To amend natl. defense act of June 3, 1916, as amended. Reptd. Jan. 3; S. 2532; Capper, Kans., R.

Similar measure: Reptd. Jan. 5; S. 3760; Wadsworth, N. Y., R.

Post Offices and Post Roads Committee

To authorize pymts. for hangars, etc., for Air Mail Service. Enacting clause stricken out in H. Dec. 31; S. 1051; Smoot, Utah, R.

To readjust pay of postmasters and reclassify pay of postal employees. President's veto sustained Jan. 6; S. 1898; Edge, N. J., R.

To reclassify salaries of postmasters employees in Postal Service, and to increase rates. Reptd. Jan. 2; S. 3674; Sterling, S. D., R.

To issue special postage stamp in recognition of Norse-American Centennial in 1925. Passed Dec. 30; Reftd. to H. P. O. and P. Rds. Com. Jan. 3; S. J. Res. 133; Norbeck, S. D., R.

Printing Committee

To authorize Secy. of Commerce to sell certain dept. publications, etc. Passed Dec. 30; Reftd. to H. Prtg. Com. Jan. 3; S. 685; Smoot, Utah, R.

Public Buildings and Grounds Committee

Naming seat of Govt. of U. S. Reptd. Dec. 19; S. 1181; Ball, Del., R. For memorial bridge across Potomac River. Passed Dec. 30; Reftd. to H. Pub. Bldg. and Grds. Com. Jan. 3; S. 3173; Fernald, Me., R.

Public Lands and Surveys Committee

For use of Fort Duchesne Resv., Utah, as branch agric. College. Recommitted to H. Pub. Lds. Com. Jan. 5; S. 667; Smoot, Utah, R.

To establish Benning Natl. Forest, Ga. Passed Dec. 30; Reftd. to H. Milt. Affrs. Com. Jan. 3; S. 1033; Harris, Ga., D.

To secure title to private lands in Militia Target Range Resv., Utah. Passed Dec. 30; Reftd. to H. Milt. Affrs. Com. Jan. 3; S. 1733; Smoot, Utah, R.

To authorize U. S. to acquire certain lands within Taos Co., N. M., by exchanging therefor timber or lands within any natl. forest in N. M. Passed H. Jan. 5; S. 1762; Bursum, N. M., R. Approved Jan. 12.

To promote mining of potash on public domain. Reptd. Jan. 8; S. 3005; Ladd, N. D., R.

To establish Utah Natl. Forest, Utah. Reptd. Jan. 8; S. 3494; Smoot, Utah, R.

For exchange of lands in Custer Natl. Forest. Reptd. Jan. 8; S. 3666; Kendrick, Wyo., D.

To repeal act of Jan. 27, 1922, providing for change of entry. Reptd. Jan. 8; S. 3839; Ladd, N. D., R.

To authorize Pres. to restore to public domain lands reserved by proclamation as natl. monuments, etc. Reptd. Jan. 8; S. 3840; Ladd, N. D., R.

Territories and Insular Possessions Committee

To authorize cooperative agreements betn. exec. depts. heads and Gov. of Alaska. Reptd. Jan. 2; S. 3714; Willis, O., R.

House Measures

Agriculture Committee

To authorize apprn. for expenses of President's agricultural conference. Reptd. Jan. 6; H. J. Res. 316; Haugen, Ia., R.

Appropriations Committee

Making apprn. for Interior Dept. for fiscal year ending June 30, 1926. Reptd. in S. Jan. 3; Passed Jan. 6; Sent to conference Jan. 9; H. R. 10020.

Making apprn. for Dept. of Agriculture for fiscal year ending June 30, 1926. Reptd. in S. Jan. 3; Passed Jan. 7; Sent to conference Jan. 12; H. R. 10404.

Making apprn. for Navy Dept., etc., for fiscal year ending June 30, 1926. Reptd. in S. Jan. 7; H. R. 10724.

Making apprn. for Treasury and P. O. Depts. for fiscal year ending June 30, 1926. Reptd. Dec. 19; Passed Dec. 30; Reftd. in S. Jan. 2; Passed Jan. 7; Sent to conference Jan. 9; S. agrees Jan. 14; H. R. 10982.

Making apprn. for War Dept. for fiscal year ending June 30, 1926. Reptd. Jan. 2; Passed Jan. 9; Reftd. to S. Apprn. Com. Jan. 10; H. R. 11248.

Making apprn. to supply deficiencies in certain apprn. for fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, etc. Reptd. Jan. 5; Passed Jan. 6; Reftd. in S. Jan. 7; Passed Jan. 13; Sent to conference Jan. 14; H. R. 11308.

Making apprn. for independent offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926. Reptd. Jan. 10; H. R. 11505.

Banking and Currency Committee

To amend act to provide for consolidation of natl. banking assns., etc. Passed Jan. 14; Reftd. to S. Bnkg. and Curcy. Com. Jan. 15; H. R. 8887; McFadden, Pa., R.

District of Columbia Committee

For past pay due to retired members of D. C. police and fire depts., etc. Reptd. Dec. 31; H. R. 5327; Gibson, Vt., R.

To provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from, District Training School. Passed Jan. 5; Reftd. to S. D. C. Com. H. R. 9435; Cramton, Mich., R.

To amend act to fix salaries of police, park and fire dept. force of D. C. Passed Jan. 12; Reftd. to S. D. C. Com. Jan. 13; H. R. 10144; Zihlman, Md., R.

To amend act regulating height of bldgs. in D. C., etc. Reptd. Jan. 15; H. R. 11214; Reed, W. Va., R.

Foreign Affairs Committee

To enlarge site and erect bldgs. of U. S. dept. and consular establ. in Tokyo, Japan. Reptd. Jan. 15; H. R. 9700; Porter, Pa., R.

Indian Affairs Committee

To amend act to provide for disposal of unallotted lands on Omaha Indian Resv., Nebr. Passed Senate Dec. 30; H. R. 6541; Howard, Nebr., R.; approved Jan. 7; Pub. Law No. 307.

To amend act fulfilling treaty stipulations with various tribes, of May 26, 1920, rel. to street pavements. Passed S. Dec. 30; H. R. 7077; Howard, Okla., D.; Approved Jan. 7; Pub. Law No. 309.

To confer jurisdiction on Court of Claims to determine certain rights Sioux Indians in Minn. Passed S. Dec. 30; H. R. 8545; Christopherson, S. D., R. Approved Jan. 9.

Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee

To make breaking of seals on freight or express shipments carried on motor trucks engaged in interst. comrc. penal offense. Reptd. by S. Interst. Comce. Com. Dec. 17; H. R. 4168; Dyer, Mo., R.

To construct vessel for Coast Guard. Passed S. Dec. 30; H. R. 6817; Winslow, Mass., R.; Approved Jan. 7; Pub. Law No. 308.

To regulate interstate transportation of black bass. Reptd. Jan. 9; H. R. 10690; Hawes, Mo., D.

Judiciary Committee

To authorize apptmt. of addtl. distr. judge in Ind. and to establish judicial divisions therein. Amended and passed S. Dec. 30; H. agrees to amdmts. Jan. 6; Conf. rept. Jan. 9; H. agrees Jan. 10; S. agrees Jan. 12; H. R. 62; Hickey, Ind., R.

For holding terms of U. S. courts in Okla., etc. Amended and passed Jan. 5; Reftd. to S. Jucdy. Com. Jan. 6; H. R. 64; Howard, Okla., D.

To amend sec. 101 of D. C. Judicial Code. Reptd. Dec. 16; H. R. 82; McClintic, Okla., D.

To establish term of U. S. dist. court at Pauls Valley, Okla. Passed S. Dec. 30; H. R. 162; Swank, Okla., D.; approved Jan. 10.

For holding U. S. distr. and circuit courts at Poleau, Okla. Passed S. Dec. 30; H. R. 644; Carter, Okla., D.; approved Jan. 10.

To authorize Court of Appeals for 1st Circuit to sit at San Juan, P. R. Passed S. Dec. 30; H. R. 704; Graham, Pa., R.; approved Jan. 8; Pub. Law No. 311.

To amend internal revenue law rel. to procedure in illegal collection claims. Passed Jan. 5; Reftd. to S. Jucdy. Com. Jan. 6; H. R. 2716; Jost, Mo., D.

To establish U. S. industrial reformatory. Passed Senate Dec. 30; H. R. 2869; Foster, O., R.; approved Jan. 7; Pub. Law No. 305.

To amend sec. 71 of Judicial Code. Reptd. Jan. 15; H. R. 5197; Parks, Ark., D.

To provide for disposition of bribe money used as evidence in Fedl. courts. Passed S. Dec. 30; H. R. 5425; Graham, Pa., R.; approved Jan. 7; Pub. Law No. 306.

To authorize each of judges of U. S. Distr. Court in Hawaii to hold sessions of court separately at same time. Passed Jan. 5; Reftd. to S. Jucdy. Com. Jan. 6; H. R. 6960; Jarrett, Del., Hawaii.

To further define jur. of cir. courts of appeals and of Sup. Court. etc. Reptd. Jan. 6; H. R. 8206; Graham, Pa., R.

To hold U. S. Distr. Court at Shelby, N. C. H. R. 8657; Graham, Pa., R.; approved Dec. 24; Pub. Law No. 300.

To amend retirement act of May 22, 1920, rel. to persons temporarily employed in Treasury Dept. Reptd. by S. Com. on Civil Serv. and passed Jan. 3; H. agrees to S. Amdmt. Jan. 6; H. R. 8906; Hickey, Ind., R.

To amend sec. 128 of Judicial Code, rel. to appeals in admiralty cases. Passed Jan. 5; Reftd. to S. Jucdy. Com. Jan. 6; H. R. 9162; Bacon, N. Y., R.

Continued on page 140

Congress Day by Day

A Daily Record of Proceedings on the Floor of the Senate and House

December 16, 1924—January 15, 1925

Official action taken on all legislation of public interest is reported in a separate department. See page 114

Tuesday, December 16, 1924

SENATE:

Mr. Sterling, S. D., R., submitted a letter from the Postmaster General accompanying the bill (S. 3674, Sterling) reclassifying salaries and readjusting rates on certain classes of mail.

By a vote of 51 to 30 agreed to motion (Ashurst, Ariz., D.) to consider the President's veto of the postal pay increase bill (S. 1898). Mr. Sterling, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, spoke on the bill (S. 3674) reclassifying salaries, which carries the same salary increases as the vetoed bill (S. 1898), but in addition provides ways and means of raising revenues to meet the increases. Mr. Ashurst objected to the second reading of the bill.

Continued consideration of Muscle Shoals bill (H. R. 518). Rejected by a vote of 49 to 32 the Smith amendment to the substitute Underwood amendment. The Smith amendment prohibited authority to lease the Muscle Shoals property and provided instead for a Federal corporation to operate the plant.

Recessed.

HOUSE:

Passed the bill (H. R. 10651, Burton, O., R.) authorizing the settlement of the indebtedness of the Republic of Lithuania to the United States, also the bill (H. R. 10650, Burton, O., R.) authorizing the settlement of the Polish debt to the United States. During the debate the French debt situation was discussed by Mr. Crisp, Ga., D., and Mr. Burton, O., R., members of the Debt Commission.

Began consideration of the bill (H. R. 10724) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926. Mr. French, Ida., R., in charge of the measure, explained the provisions of the bill. Mr. Byrnes, S. C., D., also spoke on the bill.

Mr. Jones, Tex., D., spoke on conscription of property during war times.

Mr. Guevara, Resident Commissioner from the Philippine Islands, urged the Committee on Rules to report the bill (H. R. 8856, Fairfield, Ind., R.) providing for the independence of the Philippines.

Adjourned.

Wednesday, December 17, 1924

SENATE:

Continued consideration of Muscle Shoals bill (H. R. 518). Mr. Norris, Nebr., R., spoke against the Underwood substitute amendment and criticized the President's support of that measure. Mr. Underwood, Ala., D., replied.

Unanimous consent agreement was reached to begin consideration of the President's veto message of the postal pay increase bill (S. 1898) on January 5, and to vote on the measure not later than January 6.

Confirmed the nominations of the 12 members of the Board of Tax Appeals.

Recessed.

HOUSE:

Passed by a vote of 281 to 39 the bill (H. R. 9093, Miller, Wash., R.) prohibiting transportation of certain firearms through the mail.

Passed the bill (H. R. 6942, LaGuardia, N. Y., R.) authorizing the Postmaster General to maintain air mail service.

Considered the bill (H. R. 7064, LaGuardia, N. Y., R.) to encourage commercial aviation and to authorize the Postmaster General to contract for air mail service.

Adjourned.

Thursday, December 18, 1924

SENATE:

Mr. Dill, Wash., D., made a brief speech paying tribute to the late Samuel Gompers, President of the American Federation of Labor.

Resumed consideration of the Muscle Shoals bill (H. R. 518). Mr. Bruce, Md., D., spoke in favor of the Underwood substitute amendment and attacked the principle of government ownership and operation of industrial enterprises. A request by Mr. Curtis, Kans., R., to limit debate on amendments to the bill was objected to by Mr. Norris, Nebr., R.

Confirmed the nomination of Joseph W. McIntosh to be Comptroller of the Currency in place of Henry M. Dawes, resigned.

Recessed.

HOUSE:

Passed by a vote of 292 to 15 the bill (H. R. 7064, LaGuardia, N. Y., R.) to encourage commercial aviation, etc., which had been debated on the previous day.

Resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 10724) making appropriations for the Navy Dept. and the naval service.

Mr. Johnson, Wash., R., criticized a resolution (H. J. Res. 384) submitted by Mr. Britten, Ill., R., proposing a conference of the white nations bordering the Pacific Ocean for the promotion of a better understanding between them. Mr. Britten replied.

Mr. Curry, Calif., R., announced the death of the Hon. Julius Kahn, U. S. Representative from California.

Adjourned.

Friday, December 19, 1924

SENATE:

Resumed consideration of the Muscle Shoals bill (H. R. 518). Adopted by a vote of 41 to 29 the Walsh amendment to the Underwood substitute amendment providing for government regulation of interstate distribution of power by any lessee. Mr. Norris, Nebr., R., spoke on the subsidiary companies of the General Electric Company. Mr. Johnson, Calif., R., supported the Norris plan for government ownership and operation of Muscle Shoals.

Adopted an amendment to the Underwood amendment offered by Mr. George, Ga., D., that surplus power not required under the terms of the act shall be sold. Adopted amendments offered by Mr. Harris, Ga., D., that no transfer of a lease may be made without the approval of the President, and that farmers be given preference in the sale of fertilizer manufactured. Adopted an amendment offered by Mr. Dial, S. C., D., authorizing the leasing of the properties either separately or as a whole.

The Judiciary Committee which investigated the editorial attack on Senator Underwood in the Hearst newspapers exonerated the Senator in a report (S. No. 823) which was approved without debate.

Adjourned as a mark of respect to the memory of Julius Kahn, late Representative from California.

HOUSE:

Agreed to resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) for appointment of a joint committee of the two Houses to make arrangements for the inauguration of the President on the fourth of March.

Passed the bill (H. R. 10724) making appropriations for the Navy Dept., etc., carrying a total of \$288,880,628.

Mr. Madden, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, reported the Treasury and Post Office Department appropriation bill (H. R. 10982) carrying a total of \$911,107 for the Treasury and \$636,269,415 for the Post Office Department.

Saturday, December 20, 1924

SENATE:

Resumed consideration of the Muscle Shoals bill (H. R. 518). Mr. Norris, Nebr., R., spoke on the operation of electric and waterpower utilities in Ontario.

Adjourned until Monday, December 29.

HOUSE:

Passed the Senate resolution (S. J. Res. 159) providing for the control and eradication of European fowl pest and similar diseases in poultry. Passed the Senate resolution (S. J. Res. 157) extending until February 15 an appropriation for investigation work of the Columbia basin reclamation project.

Adjourned until Monday, December 29.

Monday, December 29, 1924

SENATE:

Mr. Norris, Nebr., R., submitted a resolution (S. Res. 286) directing the Federal Trade Commission to investigate and report on the present degree of concentration of power in the hands of "power trusts," etc. Mr. Edge, N. J., R., objected to immediate consideration of the measure, and suggested it be referred to a committee. Mr. Harrison, Miss., D., and Mr. Bruce, Md., D., entered into a sharp debate over Democratic party policies and the responsibility for defeat in the recent elections.

Mr. Randall, La., D., criticized an editorial in *The Washington Post* characterizing the Rivers and Harbors Bill as a "pork barrel" measure.

Mr. Reed, Pa., R., discussed the French debt to the United States. No action was taken on the Muscle Shoals bill.

Adjourned.

HOUSE:

Began consideration of the annual appropriation bill (H. R. 10982) for the Treasury and Postoffice Departments.

Mr. Britten, Ill., R., discussed his resolution calling for a conference of the "white" nations bordering on the Pacific, and announced that

HOUSE:—continued

it might be well to modify the resolution to include "all peoples of the Pacific."

The French debt to the United States was discussed by Mr. Wingo, Ark., D., and Mr. Blanton, Tex., D.

Adjourned.

Tuesday, December 30, 1924

SENATE:

Under unanimous consent agreement considered unobjected measures on the Calendar and passed 136 bills.

Adjourned until January 2, 1925.

HOUSE:

Passed the annual appropriation bill (H. R. 10982) for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, carrying a total of \$763,000,000.

Adjourned.

Wednesday, December 31, 1924

SENATE:

Not in session.

HOUSE:

Considered bills on the Calendar relative to the postal service.

Adjourned.

Friday, January 2, 1925

SENATE:

Resumed consideration of the Muscle Shoals bill (H. R. 518).

The Norris resolution (S. 286) for an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission of an alleged power trust went over on objection by Mr. Edge, N. J., R. Mr. Norris, Nebr., R., spoke in favor of the investigation.

An amendment to the Underwood substitute amendment offered by Mr. Howell, Nebr., R., which would limit to 8% profits from the sale both of fertilizer and water power, was agreed to.

Mr. Fess, Ohio, R., spoke in opposition to the policy of government ownership.

Mr. Ladd, N. D., R., urged continued support of the experimental work of the Department of Agriculture, relative to the control of destructive diseases of cattle and farm crops.

Recessed.

HOUSE:

Considered and passed bills on the Private Calendar.

Mr. Barkley, Ky., D., author of the bill (H. R. 7358) to abolish the Railroad Labor Board, announced that the bill would not be pressed because the companion bill (S. 2646) introduced by Mr. Howell, Nebr., R., was pending on the Senate Calendar, and that there was a chance of securing favorable action in the Senate on this bill in amended form.

Adjourned.

Saturday, January 3, 1925

SENATE:

Continued consideration of the Muscle Shoals bill (H. R. 518). Mr. Brookhart, Ia., R., spoke in favor of the Norris plan for government operation of the Muscle Shoals plant.

Mr. Dial, S. C., D., urged the complete reorganization of the Democratic Party.

Mr. Moses, N. H., R., explained the provisions of the postal salary and rate increase bill (S. 3674). Mr. Norris, Nebr., R., objected to the consideration of the measure.

Adjourned.

HOUSE:

Began consideration of the bill (H. R. 11248) making appropriations for the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926.

Mr. Gabaldon, Resident Commissioner from the Philippine Islands, spoke on Philippine independence and criticized a series of articles on the Philippine Islands by Katherine Mayo appearing in *The Washington Post*.

Mr. Watkins, Ore., D., spoke against the bill (S. 2327, Gooding, Ida., R.) to amend the long-and-short-haul clause (Section 4) of the I. C. C. act.

Mr. Blanton, Tex., D., spoke on the D. C. Rent Commission and criticized the proposed legislation which would make the Commission permanent.

Adjourned.

Monday, January 5, 1925

SENATE:

Under unanimous consent agreement considered the postal pay increase bill (S. 1898) vetoed by the President last June. The measure was debated by Mr. Edge, N. J., R., Mr. Sterling, S. D., R., Mr. Willis, Ohio, R., and Mr. George, Ga., D. A motion to refer the bill and the veto message to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was rejected by a vote of 52 to 30.

Recessed.

HOUSE:

Considered and passed measures pending on the Consent Calendar.

The Committee on Appropriations reported the bill (H. R. 11308) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1925, etc. The bill carried \$157,111,700. Of this, \$150,000,000 would be available for refund of illegally collected taxes; \$3,501,200 for continuing work on dam No.

2 at Muscle Shoals, and \$3,000,000 for purchase of the capital stock of the new Inland Waterways Corporation.

Adjourned.

Tuesday, January 6, 1925

SENATE:

The President's veto of the postal pay increase bill (S. 1898) was sustained, the vote being 55 to 29, which was one less than the required two-thirds vote necessary to reject the veto.

Mr. Ladd, N. D., R., read out of the Republican Party at its first conference of this session, spoke in defense of the political conduct of himself and his colleagues in supporting the third party ticket in the recent campaign.

The Bruce amendment to the Underwood substitute amendment to the Norris substitute amendment to the Muscle Shoals bill was rejected. The Bruce amendment was designed to prevent the manufacture of fertilizer at Muscle Shoals.

Recessed at 4:50 P. M. until 8 P. M.

At the evening session the Interior Department appropriation bill (H. R. 10020) carrying approximately \$239,700,000 was passed.

Recessed.

HOUSE:

Passed the emergency deficiency bill (H. R. 11308) carrying a total of approximately \$157,000,000.

Adjourned.

Wednesday, January 7, 1925

SENATE:

Mr. Dial, S. C., D., requested and obtained consent to withdraw from the Record his speech of January 3.

Adopted a resolution (S. Res. 290, Gerry, R. I., D.) favorably reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, requesting the President to furnish the Senate information respecting any protests received from foreign powers against the elevation of guns on U. S. battleships.

A unanimous consent agreement was reached that on January 8 the Senate proceed to vote on any amendment to the Underwood amendment to the Muscle Shoals bill (H. R. 518), and then upon the said amendment. The bill (H. R. 518) was then temporarily laid aside and the Agriculture Department appropriation bill (H. R. 10404) was considered and passed. The bill carried \$125,000,000.

Passed the bill (H. R. 10982) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, carrying \$763,309,058.

Recessed.

HOUSE:

Considered the War Department appropriation bill (H. R. 11248) carrying \$1,331,000,000.

Adjourned.

Thursday, January 8, 1925

SENATE:

Mr. Walsh, Mont., D., spoke on the ratification by the States of the child labor amendment to the Constitution, and denounced the organized campaign against the amendment.

By a vote of 48 to 37 the Underwood amendment in the nature of a substitute for the Norris Amendment was agreed to in Committee of the Whole. The Underwood amendment providing for private operation of the Muscle Shoals plant was reported to the Senate with numerous amendments pending. Mr. Gooding, Ida., R., spoke in favor of the Norris proposal for Government ownership and operation of Muscle Shoals.

Recessed.

HOUSE:

Resumed consideration of the War Department appropriation bill (H. R. 11248.)

Adjourned.

Friday, January 9, 1925

SENATE:

Resumed consideration of the Muscle Shoals bill (H. R. 518). Mr. Norris, Nebr., R., urged the adoption of his plan for government operation, and denounced the Underwood amendment as a scheme to aid the "Water Power Trust." Mr. Robinson, Ark., D., replied to the attack upon the Democratic Party made by Mr. Norris.

The President transmitted a letter from the Secretary of State in response to a resolution (S. Res. 290, Gerry, R. I., D.) relative to protests made by any foreign power against the elevation of guns on U. S. battleships.

Recessed.

HOUSE:

Passed the omnibus pension bill (H. R. 11354) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and to certain of their widows and dependent children.

Passed the War Department appropriation bill (H. R. 11248), carrying a total of \$331,000,000. The personnel of the army is maintained at 12,000 officers and 119,000 enlisted men, exclusive of the 8,000 Philippine Scouts.

Mr. Hickey, Ind., R., presented the conference report on the bill (H. R. 62) to create an additional Federal judgeship in Indiana.

Continued on page 140

National Defense and the Limiting of Naval Armament

Chronology of Events in U. S. Naval History
Comparison of Naval Strength of Treaty Powers
The Navy Today: Policy - Organization - Activities

The Naval Controversy
Pro and Con Discussion by Members of Congress
Naval Experts, and Peace Organizations

Chronology of Events in U. S. Naval History

1775, June 12—First sea fight of the Revolution off Machias, Me. Two small coasting vessels manned by volunteers (armed chiefly with axes and pitchforks) under command of Jeremiah O'Brien, captured the English war cutter *Margaretha*.

Oct. 13—First official step toward the establishment of United States Navy. Silas Deane, Christopher Gadsden and John Langdon, "Fathers of Our Navy", were appointed a committee by Congress to fit out two warships to cruise against the British.

Oct. 27—Special Committee presented bill to Congress for the acquisition of five ships of 32 guns each, five of 28, and three of 24 guns.

Oct. 30—Congress authorized two vessels of war.

Oct. 13—Entire Committee Bill authorized by Congress.

Dec. 3—First flag ever unfurled aboard an American warship was hoisted by Lieut. John Paul Jones, "Founder of our Navy," on board the flagship *Alfred*, at Philadelphia. It was the "grand union" flag, having 13 American stripes, with the English Union Jack in the field.

1776, Feb. 17—First regularly organized naval expedition of the United States put to sea under the orders of Capt. Esek Hopkins. The fleet consisted of the 24-gun ship *Alfred*, 20-gun ship *Columbus*, 14-gun brig *Andrea*, *Doria* and *Cabot*, 12-gun brig *Providence*, 10-gun sloop *Hornet*, and 8-gun schooners *Wasp* and *Fly*, all commissioned Dec. 3, 1775.

Mar. 3—Capt. Hopkins' force won victory over the enemy at Nassau, Island of New Providence.

July 4—America declares her independence.

1777, June 14—Design of present American flag adopted.

Aug.—The first submarine boat ever invented made a successful attack on the British frigate *Cerberus*.

Nov. 13—Capt. John Paul Jones, in 18-gun American cruiser *Ranger*, while in Quiberon Bay, France, received the first salute to the Stars and Stripes in Europe.

1781, Sept. 7—Robert Morris appointed Agent of Marine (corresponding in duties to our present Secretary of the Navy), serving until Nov. 1, 1784.

1782, Nov. 30—Provisional Peace Articles signed between Great Britain and the United States. Steps were immediately taken to disband the Navy.

1783.—In the Revolution the British had 202 warships captured or destroyed. In all there were about 800 vessels taken from the British by our sea forces.

1787, Sept. 17—Constitution of the United States ratified by States convention.

1789, Aug. 7—The Department of War, under the new Constitution of the United States of America, assumed supervision of naval affairs, there being no Navy Department in existence.

1794, Mar. 27—Congress took steps to create a new Navy. By this act six frigates were authorized. They were the famous group to which the *Constitution* belonged, and were made necessary because of the depredations on our commerce by the Algerian corsairs.

1798, Apr. 30—Secretary of the Navy added to the President's Cabinet, Benjamin Stoddert being the first Secretary.

July 9—Congress declared naval war upon France because of the persistent depredations on our commerce by French cruisers and privateers.

July 11—The Marine Corps established as an adjunct to the Navy.

1801, Feb. 3—Treaty of peace with France ratified. 84 armed vessels were captured from the French; the French captured one of our warships.

May 14—The Bashaw of Tripoli declared war against the United States because we did not pay our "tribute" promptly. About the same time other potentates of the semi-piratical states of Barbary began hostile measures against the United States.

1804, Aug. 3—Americans began series of bombardments on Tripoli which resulted in its capture.

1805, June 3—Treaty of peace signed with Tripoli.

1807, June 22—Our 36-gun ship *Chesapeake*, Capt. Barron, attacked off the Virginian coast by the 50-gun English frigate *Leopard* and was compelled to surrender.

1812, June 18—Congress declared war against Great Britain. At that time England had 1,048 warships with 27,800 guns, and the United States 17 warships with 442 guns.

Aug. 13—First naval action of the War of 1812. The 32-gun frigate *Essex*, Capt. Porter, captured the English 16-gun sloop of war, *Albert*, 3 of the enemy wounded, no American casualties.

1814, Dec. 25—Treaty of peace signed ending War of 1812 with Great Britain.

1815, June 17—Before the war with England had been concluded the United States had declared war on Algiers as the result of outrages on American merchantmen. A squadron under Captain Decatur in the Mediterranean on June 17 captured the Algerian flagship.

1821.—From this year to the close of 1825 our naval forces were actively engaged in suppressing piracy in the West Indies and slave trade on the African coast. During this period, the navy introduced steam vessels into its service.

1832, Feb. 7—Because of attacks on American merchantmen, the 44-gun frigate *Potomac* landed a force of men in Sumatra and attacked the town of Qualla Battou.

1838, Dec. 20—Qualla Battou again bombarded, for repetition of outrages.

1838-1842—The Wilkes expedition, one of the most notable scientific expeditions in history.

1844, Oct. 1—The establishment of the Naval Observatory at Washington.

1845, Aug. 15—Establishment of the Naval Academy at Annapolis.

1846, May 12—War with Mexico declared by the United States.

1846, July 2—A force of 250 men from American squadron under Capt. Sloat, landed at Monterey, Calif., and occupied the place in the name of the United States.

1847, Jan. 8-15—Capt. Stockton led 700 American sailors inland and defeated a Mexican army at San Gabriel, Cal., and again at Mesa.

Our sailors marched into Los Angeles in triumph, having actually conquered the lower part of California.

1848, Feb. 2—Treaty of peace signed with Mexico.

1853, July 14—Commodore Perry landed his expedition at Yokohama, Japan, and formally delivered the message of friendship from the President of the United States to the emperor. It resulted in the opening of Japan to foreign commerce.

1856, Nov. 20—Because the Chinese forts wantonly fired on the Americans at Canton, a large force of sailors and marines was landed under Commander Foote, and, after a two days' fight, the Chinese were defeated.

1859, June 25—Captain Tatnall made his famous dash to the assistance of the British and French who were sorely pressed in their attack on the Peliu forts, North China.

1861, Apr. 21—Start of Civil War. The Navy was built up during the Civil War into a large blockade force.

1862, Mar. 9—Famous battle between "ironclads," the *Monitor* and *Merrimac*. Owing to the protection afforded by the armor none was killed and only a few wounded.

1865, Apr. 9—Close of Civil War.

1884, Oct. 6—Naval War College established.

1898, Feb. 15—United States battleship *Maine* blown up in Havana Harbor, with a loss of 260 men out of a complement of 350.

Apr. 25—United States declared that war with Spain existed from Apr. 21.

The major fleet engagements during the Spanish-American War were conducted by Admiral Sampson in the Atlantic operations and Admiral Dewey in the Asiatic operations.

Aug. 12—Treaty of peace signed with Spain.

1900, Mar. 13—Navy General Board established, succeeding "Naval War Board" organized to assist the Secretary of the Navy in conducting the war with Spain.

May—Rear Admiral Kempff, commanding the flagship *Newark* in Chinese waters, assisted in defense of the foreign embassies in Peking, besieged by the Boxer revolutionists.

1907—Cruise of an American fleet around the world as a demonstration of the naval power of the United States.

1914, April 21—Mexican complications led to the occupation of Vera Cruz by marines.

1914, July 28—Austria declared war on Serbia. (Beginning of World War.)

1915, Mar. 3—National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics established, thru the Navy Department appropriation bill.

1916, Aug. 29—Act of Congress established office of Chief of Naval Operations; percentage of commissioned officer personnel; naval flying corps; a naval Reserve Force; reorganized the Navy on a preparation

for war basis, and authorized the construction of 10 battleships, 6 battle cruisers, 10 scout cruisers, 50 destroyers, 9 fleet submarines, 58 Coast submarines, 3 full ships, 1 transport; 1 hospital ship, 2 destroyer tenders, 1 fleet submarine tender, 2 ammunition ships and 2 gunboats. This construction bill was supplemented by the Act of Mar. 4, 1917.

1917, May 22—Enlisted strength of the Navy increased by Act of Congress to 150,000 and the marine corps to 30,000.

1918, Apr. 6—U. S. participation in World War. Convoy of troops to Europe. Suppression of German submarine menace. Surrender of the German fleet Nov. 21, 1918, to the allied British and American navies in the North Sea.

1920, June 4—Act of Congress establishing Marine Corps strength at 27,000; employment of Naval Reserve force on active duty.

1921, July 12—Authorized Navy enlisted strength set at 86,000.

July 12—Act of Congress authorized and requested President to call a Conference on Limitation of Armaments.

Nov. 12—Limitation of Armament Conference met at Washington upon the invitation of the President of the United States.

1922, Feb. 6—Delegates of five powers, United States, Great Britain, Japan, France, Italy, signed the Treaty for the Limitation of Naval Armaments at Washington.

Mar. 29—United States Senate ratified the Treaty for the Limitation of Naval Armaments.

July 1—Act of Congress for disposal of United States war vessels as provided for by the treaty for Limitation of Naval Armaments.

Dec. 6—United States naval forces organized into U. S. Fleet with Admiral Hillary P. Jones as Commander-in-Chief. This organization subdivided the fleet into the Battle Fleet, Scouting Fleet, Fleet Base Force, Control Force with other naval forces including the Asiatic detachment; U. S. Naval Forces in Europe, Special Service Squadron and Naval district forces.

1923, Aug. 17—Final ratification by the five powers filed in Washington and Treaty for Limitation of Naval Armaments became effective.

Aug. 24—The President approved the Secretary of the Navy's recommendation for disposal of United States war vessels as outlined by the Treaty for Limitation of Naval Armaments.

The United States Navy Today

Fundamental Naval Policy

THE NAVY OF THE UNITED STATES should be maintained in sufficient strength to support its policies and its commerce, and to guard its continental and overseas possessions.

General Naval Policy

TO CREATE, maintain and operate a navy second to none; and in conformity with the ratios for capital ships established by the Treaty for Limitation of Naval Armament.

TO MAKE war efficiency the object of all training, and to maintain that efficiency during the entire period of peace.

TO DEVELOP and to organize the Navy for operations in any part of either ocean.

TO MAKE strength of the Navy for battle of primary importance.

TO MAKE strength of the Navy for exercising ocean-wide economic pressure next in importance.

TO ENCOURAGE, and endeavor to lead in, the development of the art and material of naval warfare.

TO CULTIVATE friendly and sympathetic relations with the whole world by foreign cruises.

TO SUPPORT in every possible way American interests, especially the expansion and development of American foreign commerce.

TO MAINTAIN a marine corps of such strength that it will be able adequately to support the navy by furnishing detachments to vessels of the fleet in full commission, guards for shore stations, garrisons for outlying positions; and by the maintenance in readiness of an expeditionary force.

TO COOPERATE fully and loyally with all departments of the government.

The Fleet and Its Auxiliary Craft

By Theodore Roosevelt

Former Assistant Secretary, U. S. Department of the Navy

OUR NAVY at present can be divided roughly into two heads—the shore establishment, and the fleet afloat. The shore establishment has as its mission the service of the fleet afloat. It is composed mainly of yards where the ships are repaired by skilled civilian workmen, many of whom have been in the government service all of their lives. These yards are situated at strategic points on our coasts and in certain of our outlying possessions. Without them, the Navy would be helpless; and radio stations whereby our ships the world over are kept in close contact with the government at Washington. In addition we have manufacturing plants such as our Aircraft Factory at Philadelphia; training depots for the new recruits; supply bases, and other similar developments—all necessary to the maintenance of the complicated and diverse machine of a modern navy. In these shore activities, approximately speaking, fifty thousand civilians are employed.

The fleet afloat is, of course, the main objective and the one to which all efforts are primarily bent. The fleet afloat is now a single fleet under a single admiral. It can be divided roughly into five groups. The first of these is the battleships. They correspond to the infantry in the army. From time immemorial they have formed the backbone of our naval

defense. It is the great guns of the capital ships that hammer out victory when the fate of the nation hangs in the balance. Important and vital as the other elements are, they are, in the final analysis, but supplemental arms.

The next group is the auxiliary surface craft. In this group are the light cruisers, the cavalry of the Navy. In peace or in war, they are the far cruising rapid units. It also contains the destroyers. Their main weapon is the torpedo and they screen the great ships in action.

The third group is composed of the submarines, which embody many and diverse functions. They are a constant threat to all fighting units. They can be used for breaking an attack formation. Furthermore, they can scout unsupported by other units and are of great value for laying mines where surface craft dare not penetrate.

The fourth division, aviation, is new and only partially developed, but it will assume an increasingly important role as the years go by, and experience and invention eliminate the problems that limit it at present. There are three missions with which naval aviation is charged. It co-operates with the army in coast defense; it operates to a limited extent from the decks of the battleships; and it functions as an auxiliary arm from the aircraft carriers. As battle ranges have now

increased to over thirty thousand yards, the use of airplanes in action to observe and report the fall of projectiles has become essential to accuracy of fire against an enemy beyond the horizon. We have at this time two vessels partly constructed which will be aircraft carriers. Their length is greater than that of any other ship in the Navy. Each one of them will carry from seventy to eighty planes, depending upon the type and size of planes. They will accompany the fleet in action. From their decks will rise scouting planes to be used as the eyes of the Admiral, torpedo and bombing planes for attack and fighting planes to repel an enemy aerial attack.

The last important group is the non-combatant auxiliary craft. It is difficult for the average individual to realize just how vessels of this sort are necessary, but a modern battle fleet is helpless without them. Some are specialized and must be a part of the regular Navy. These number such units as hospital ships, supply ships, repair ships and transports. Others are more general in character, and whereas it is necessary to have some of them at all times in commission and on hand, may be supplemented by the merchant marine in time of need. These number such units as oilers, colliers and cargo vessels.—*Extracts, see 1, p. 143.*

The Mission of the Marine Corps

By J. H. Craig

Captain, U. S. Marine Corps

THE U. S. Marine Corps traces its descent from the English organization now known as the Royal Marines of Great Britain, "Britain's Sea Soldiers." The American Colonies, in organizing their armed forces for the Revolutionary War, followed the example of the mother country and on November 10, 1775, the Continental Congress provided by enactment for the organization of two Battalions of Marines, to consist chiefly of men with a knowledge of the sea. These battalions took part in engagements, both ashore and afloat, during the War of the Revolution.

Upon the making of peace with Great Britain, the Continental Marines, like the Continental Army and Navy, ceased to exist until after the adoption of the Constitution and the installation of the Federal Government, and it was not until July 11, 1798, that the Marine Corps, by Act of Congress, was brought into being in substantially the same form that it exists today.

The Act of June 30, 1834, provided that the Marine Corps was subject to Navy laws and regulations except when all or part of it was detached for service with the Army, when that part would be governed by the Articles of War. Since 1834 the Marine Corps has definitely become a part of the Naval Service.

The Marine Corps functions administratively under the command of the Commandant of the Corps. He is solely

responsible to the Secretary of the Navy for the discipline and efficiency of the Corps.

The Marine Corps mission may be succinctly stated as follows, viz.: To support the United States Fleet, and to aid the Navy in carrying out that part of the policy of the government which has been or may be assigned to it. In carrying out this mission, the Marine Corps is called on for the performance of many and varied duties. These may be classified as follows:

- (a) Detachments to guard and protect navy yards, naval bases, and other naval utilities, at home and abroad.
- (b) Guards for American legations in foreign countries, such guards being under the jurisdiction of the flag officer in command of the naval forces on the station.
- (c) Landing forces to protect American lives, rights and interests.
- (d) Forces of occupation to restore order and to maintain peace and tranquility in disturbed countries, as, for instance, Haiti and Santo Domingo.
- (e) Detachments for Marine Corps administrative purposes, such as the recruiting service, training stations, supply depots, etc.
- (f) Marine detachments for service on board the vessels of the Fleet.
- (g) Expeditionary forces for service with the Fleet in war.

The Purpose of the Naval Reserve

By J. A. Schofield

Commander, U. S. N. R. F.

ALL GREAT nations must perforce maintain reserves of officers and men especially trained and immediately available in case of sudden emergency, but who derive their means of sustenance from other lines of endeavor, who are producers rather than consumers so far as the public purse is concerned.

The strength of the British Naval Reserve is approximately 2,200 officers in all grades from midshipman to commodore, and 44,000 men.

Likewise Japan maintains a naval reserve, consisting of approximately 1,800 officers and 30,000 men.

Our own Navy Department has enunciated the following policies in this regard:

To create, organize, and train a naval reserve sufficient to provide the supplementary personnel necessary to mobilize the fleet and all its auxiliaries. To make the Naval Reserve Force secure in its status and organization as a part of the Navy and to guard its best interest. To cultivate a close association of officers of the active Navy and the Naval Reserve. To emphasize, in the training of the reserves, the

duties most likely to be assigned them afloat upon mobilization. To be generous in assigning officers to duty with the Naval Reserve and to educational institutions.

The need for a body of trained civilians ready to augment the Navy in time of war appears first to have been seriously realized by the state of Massachusetts, which passed an act in 1887, "To create a Naval Battalion to be attached to the Volunteer Militia."

On June 30, 1916, twenty-one states, one territory and the District of Columbia, maintained naval militia organizations totalling 638 officers and 9,170 men.

The establishment of a naval reserve force exclusively under Federal control was seriously considered from time to time, but no enabling legislation was secured till March 3, 1915, when Congress authorized a naval reserve to be composed of men discharged from the Navy.

By the Act of August 29, 1916, the present Naval Reserve Force was brought into being; it provided for a body of officers and men, who, in joining, obligated themselves to

serve in the Navy in time of war or during the existence of a national emergency.

The Acts of August 29, 1916, and July 1, 1918, and certain portions of subsequent appropriation bills, give us the Naval Reserve Force as it is today.

At the conclusion of the World War there were 21,985 officers and 273,094 men on the rolls of the Naval Reserve Force. These were released from active duty and an attempt was made to form them into various drilling organizations, but satisfactory results were not obtained.

In September, 1921, the Navy Department, finding it impossible to carry on the Naval Reserve then in existence under existing laws and with the amount appropriated for that purpose for the fiscal year 1922, disenrolled [practically] the entire Naval Reserve Force.

A board of experienced officers was called to make a thorough study of the entire naval reserve situation and to make recommendations as to remedial measures. A very

complete report was submitted, recommending remedial legislation substantially in the form now pending before both houses of Congress, in H. R. 9634 and S. 1807.

In the meantime, pending the enactment of remedial legislation, it was desired to carry on the Reserve as a going organization as far as possible with those members who had remained in the Reserve. Several of the states reorganized their Naval Militia, and congressional assent having been secured, these functioned as naval militia organizations with dual membership—Naval Reserve and Naval Militia. This arrangement is still in existence in these states and has proved satisfactory in many ways. Sufficient money was appropriated for the fiscal years 1923, 1924 and 1925 by Congress to resume activities in a small way.

Since July, 1922, the drilling and training of the Naval Reserve Force has, therefore, been steadily going ahead, in spite of adverse conditions, and in spite of occasional new and adverse interpretations of existing laws.

The Naval Duties of the Merchant Marine

By W. S. Benson

Rear Admiral U. S. N. (Retired), Commissioner U. S. Shipping Board

IN TIME of war a navy does not lie at anchor in port and wait until the enemy approaches within firing distance of the coast before it assumes its defensive duties. Those duties involve going out to sea and meeting the enemy before he has a chance to open fire on the home coast. To do this fighting craft must be supported by auxiliary craft. These include scouts, transports, colliers, oil tankers, ammunition ships, aircraft carriers and various other craft with specialized equipment. A certain number of these vessels must be specially constructed for naval purposes and are useless for anything else.

Working with these there should be regular cargo boats for carrying supplies, passenger ships to carry troops, colliers and oil tankers which are not specialized and which may be used in valuable commercial pursuits during peace. And there is where the merchant marine comes in. With a healthy, well developed merchant marine in operation, a nation need not spend so much money on its actual naval auxiliary, since, when war comes, its merchant marine is immediately called into service to support the navy. For many years America has been without that necessary support.

When the war with Spain came we had no real auxiliary support for the navy. In order to carry his fuel and other supplies into Manila Bay, Admiral Dewey was compelled to hire British vessels.

"The American Line" had purchased from the British the "New York" and "Philadelphia," and had built in this country "The St. Louis" and "The St. Paul." These four ships, made possible by subsidy, were the only merchant vessels of good speed and ocean going size that the United

States possessed. Upon the declaration of war with Spain all four were procured by the navy and fitted with guns and naval crews. Because of their speed and steaming radius they were sent scouting for Admiral Cervera's fleet on the Atlantic.

In 1908-09 President Roosevelt sent an American fleet around the world. Did American auxiliary colliers and supply ships go along with the American fighting ships? No. The United States Government hired merchant ships and colliers from foreign lines to do this work.

In the World War it would have been impossible to move our troops in such large numbers or our stores in such large quantities had it not been possible for us to call on ships flying foreign flags. Due to the fact that practically every important shipping nation except the enemy was our ally, we could draw upon them for assistance in the form of merchant ships. We can never expect such a favorable condition to exist again.

Non-fighting auxiliary vessels are absolutely necessary for the successful use of our fighting force in time of war. And it is quite as necessary that these vessels should be owned by Americans and readily available. Instead of burdening the tax-payers to provide all these vessels for the Navy and have them lying idle in time of peace, the sound policy is to build up a suitable merchant marine which in normal times can be used for carrying our commerce and keeping our shipbuilding plants going. I know of no element of national defense more important or that can be maintained at less cost than a proper merchant marine. Instead of being a liability in normal times, it becomes an asset. But above all, it is always ready and at our own command.

The United States Naval Academy

By M. S. Tisdale

Lieutenant Commander, U. S. N.

SINCE 1845 the United States Government has maintained at Annapolis, Maryland, a university known as the United States Naval Academy, which has for its purpose the education and training of midshipmen to be commissioned officers in the line of the Navy. Prior to the founding of this Academy officers were required to get their schooling

as best they could from civilian school masters placed on board Navy ships for that purpose. The weakness of this system was long apparent, but failing Congressional approval it was the best available. In 1845 the Secretary of the Navy, George Bancroft, placed virtually all of the school masters on inactive duty and used the pay which

would have been theirs for starting what was then called the "Naval School." This small school has developed in the world for the training of Naval Officers.

The midshipmen at the Academy come from all walks of life. There is no bar to any man who is duly appointed and who is able to qualify mentally and physically.

According to existing law, young Americans between the ages of 16 and 20 are eligible for appointment to the Naval Academy by Senators and Representatives in Congress. The basic law allows 5 for each of the appointing powers mentioned, but through a restriction in the present Appropriation Bill it is now possible for them to send but three each. In addition to these appointments there are 15 each year by the President of the United States, and 100 each year by the Secretary of the Navy from enlisted men who have served at least one year and who are not more than 20 years of age. A candidate who has been appointed is then required to establish his qualifications mentally and

physically. If accepted he deposits an entrance fee of \$100. All of his other expenses during the four year course are paid by the Government.

When a candidate has qualified he is called before the Commandant of Midshipmen to take the following oath which is his Rubicon, for it is in most cases the step which definitely severs his connection with civil life and starts him upon his life's career:

"I, John Doe, of the State of . . . , age . . . years, having been appointed a Midshipman, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter: SO HELP ME GOD."—*Extracts, see 2 p. 143.*

Peace Time Activities of the U. S. Navy

By L. M. Overstreet

Captain, U. S. N.

OUR forefathers, at the time of the American Revolution, felt that the safety of our country was of such great importance that one of their reasons for establishing the Constitution of the United States was to "provide for the common defense." The policy of the Navy Department is "that the Navy of the United States should be maintained in sufficient strength to support its policies and its commerce, and to guard its continental and overseas possessions." The use of the Navy in time of war is well known. In time of peace the fleet carries out our foreign policies and our foreign policies are no stronger than our fleet.

The most important foreign policies of the United States are the Monroe Doctrine and the Open Door. An incident can best serve to illustrate how the fleet upholds the Monroe Doctrine. The German Emperor (in 1902) declined to arbitrate certain claims his country had made against Venezuela, and the German fleet was about to seize Venezuelan territory. Although it was said the seizure was to be temporary, it was most probable that the territory would be held permanently and made into a base from which the German fleet could operate against the Panama Canal. As this seizure was contrary to the Monroe Doctrine, President Roosevelt informed the German Ambassador, in no uncertain terms, that unless the Emperor agreed to arbitrate, he would send Admiral Dewey to Venezuelan waters with the American fleet, with orders to prevent this seizure of territory. Germany agreed to arbitrate. This shows clearly that our foreign policies would be mere "scraps of paper" unless we had a fleet to support them.

In times past when many foreign countries were closed to commerce, the Navy played an important part in opening their ports to our trade. In 1811 we had a trade valued at over one million dollars annually with Turkey, but our commerce was restricted as our cargoes had to be landed at Smyrna. Our naval commander therefore arranged with the Turkish government to open all their ports to our trade. After the British-Chinese opium war in 1842, a treaty was made wherein China opened five of her seaports to British merchants. Our naval commander on the Asiatic Station at once arranged with the Chinese Viceroy to give the American merchants the same privilege which had been accorded the British. In 1854, by particularly able diplomatic work, Commodore Perry opened Japan to the commerce of the world.

The Navy makes a study of trade routes, not only to learn the routes used by America, but those used by all powers of the world. In time of war it would be very necessary for our Navy to know all the trade routes of the world in order to stop shipping destined to an enemy's country. If, for instance, the enemy needed fuel oil to keep their ships operating, it would be very necessary to cut the trade routes along which this material was being shipped.

In order to give our commerce and our citizens abroad the best possible protection, the Navy has divided the whole world into sea areas and placed an Admiral with a squadron of ships in each area. Whenever there is any sign of revolution, any indication that our citizens or commerce may be interfered with, it is the duty of the admiral assigned to the area in question to send men-of-war to the scene. By international agreement, certain of the great powers have agreed to keep the railroad open from Peking to the sea during revolutions in China. The Navy sometime ago erected a powerful radio station in Peking, so that our admiral is now able to keep in constant touch with our legation and the worry of the old Boxer days is a thing of the past. At that time no word could be obtained from the Americans besieged in Peking for days.

Our farmers export over a billion pounds of meat products, over four million bushels of wheat and corn, and over six million bales of cotton annually overseas. This trade needs protection. Some years ago an American ship was proceeding into the docks in a South American port when a man-of-war, manned by a band of revolutionists fired on her. An American cruiser at once opened fire, and our cargoes were not again interfered with in that port.

Recent Activities

The American Navy was the first to bring relief from the outside world to the earthquake sufferers in Japan. Destroyers were rushed to Yokohama and Tokyo and Americans and other foreigners were taken on board and cared for and later taken to Kobe. Medical assistance was given to the burned and maimed. Fresh water, food and medicine was supplied. People were taken on board ships until provision could be made for them on shore. A destroyer was put at the disposal of business men to take them from Kobe back to Yokohama to be the first in resuming business. The American Ambassador and family were quartered

Continued on page 143

A Glossary of Naval Terms

By Hon. T. Douglas Robinson

Assistant Secretary, U. S. Department of the Navy

Armor: Steel plates secured to sides and important parts of ships as a protection against gunfire or close external explosions.

Armament: Offensive weapons with which ships are equipped, such as guns and torpedoes, and their tubes.

Caliber: Diameter of the bore of a gun.

Displacement: The weight of water in tons displaced by the floating vessel; in other words, the weight of the vessel. (Tonnage.)

Draft: Depth of ship from keel to water line.

Freeboard: Height from water line to main deck.

Knot: A unit of speed equivalent to one nautical mile (2,000 yards) an hour.

Speed: The speed of vessels is given in knots.

Capital Ship: A ship of large displacement, heavy armor, large gun armament, moderately high speed, able to keep the high seas; of maximum offensive power, and with maximum defense against gun, bomb, and torpedo attack.

Battleship (Capital Ship): A ship of very large displacement, limited by treaty to 35,000 tons, capable of steaming on the high seas at 21 to 25 knots, protected by heavy armor and carrying a heavy armament of large caliber guns, limited by treaty to 16-inch, a secondary battery of 5 to 7-inch guns, an anti-aircraft battery, and carrying scouting aircraft.

Battle Cruiser (Capital Ship): An armored cruiser having the general battleship characteristics of armament, *i. e.*, main battery of all big guns (11 inches or more in caliber), eight or more, and an intermediate battery. Armor heavier than armored cruisers but lighter than battleships, and very high speed, from 25 to 30 knots and over, and large displacement, from 17,000 tons up.

Aircraft Carrier: A ship limited by treaty to 33,000 tons displacement, and to 8 large guns, 8 inches in caliber, capable of steaming with the Fleet, having a platform deck on which aircraft may land or from which aircraft may take off, and besides, carrying large numbers of aircraft below decks, which may be brought to the platform deck.

Cruiser: A ship limited by treaty to 10,000 tons displacement, protected by moderately heavy side armor, capable of steaming at 35 knots, armed with guns limited by treaty to not more than 8 inches in caliber, anti-aircraft battery, torpedo tubes, and carrying scouting aircraft. The scout cruiser is capable of steaming on the high seas with sufficient freeboard to keep dry in moderate weather, and with sufficient space for stores and fuel to permit her to steam great distances without having to visit port to refuel.

Different types of cruisers are: "Scout," a cruiser usually meaning one of treaty limit size; "light," a cruiser of about 7,500 tons displacement, with 6-inch guns, and of high speed. Other cruiser types (except battle cruisers) are of older design and would be of little value in a major fleet engagement.

Destroyers: Large torpedo craft of 1,200 tons displacement, capable of steaming on the high seas, carrying torpedo tubes with 8 to 12 torpedoes, guns about 4-inch caliber, and depth charges, and having speed of 30 to 35 knots. Destroyers may carry scouting aircraft. Destroyers, second line, are of 1,000 tons displacement or less, not capable of steaming at 35 knots, and chiefly of value as coast defense units or escort of slow merchant convoys.

Destroyer Leaders are of a type similar to light cruisers and are designed to act as flagships for destroyer squadrons.

Depth Charge: A depth charge is cylindrical in shape and

contains about 300 pounds of TNT. It can be set to explode after sinking at a certain depth.

Submarines: Vessels capable of running either on the surface of the water or submerged. The offensive armament is the torpedo and the small-caliber gun. In the late war the Germans also used guns up to 6 inches in caliber as an offensive and defensive weapon. Their speed varies from 5 to 10 knots submerged and from 10 to 24 knots on the surface. Displacement from 300 to 2,700 tons. Submarines are not able to maneuver speedily, owing to their elongated shape. Submersion is effected by taking water into tanks and by use of hydroplanes on the bows. Submarines may also be used as mine layers, mercantile carriers, and may carry scouting aircraft when on the surface. Submarines, large, may be classed as of 2,000 tons and above, able to steam with the fleet. Submarines, first line, may be classed as 800 to 1,100 tons, able to act in coast defense. Submarines, second line, may be classed as 400 to 600 tons, able to act in coast defense.

Mine Layers: Ships capable of steaming on the high seas at fleet speed, lightly armed, and used to lay a mine field.

Mine Sweepers: Small ships, lightly armed, used for sweeping up mine fields.

Gunboats: Vessels used for patrol purposes, of varying displacement (243 to 1,600 tons), of about 12 knots speed, armed with guns of about 4-inch caliber and smaller rapid fire guns. Such vessels are used in protecting American interests in China and Central America.

Auxiliaries: A term usually applied to naval ships which are invaluable aids to ships listed above, in fueling, provisioning, etc., when away from shore bases. This includes tenders, colliers, repair ships, supply ships, capable of steaming on the high seas at Fleet speed; armed with small-caliber guns for submarine, anti-aircraft and destroyer defense. Of late, due to the Limitation of Armament Treaty, all types of ships except battleships and aircraft carriers have fallen into a popular terminology of "auxiliary types."

Aircraft: Any form of craft designed for the navigation of the air—airplanes, airships, balloons, helicopters, kites, kite balloons, omithopters, gliders, etc. Different types of airplanes are bombing, scouting, fighting, spotting (for fire-control)—either with landing gear for land or with floats for sea landing.

Blister: An extra compartment built around the underwater portion of a ship to act as an extra defense against torpedo attack.

Naval Bases: A naval base is, generically, a center from which men-of-war can operate and be maintained, and may be of a permanent or temporary character, depending upon whether its constructed naval accommodations are of a fixed or transient nature. Naval Bases are divided geographically into two classes, home bases—within the continental territory of the country—and outlying bases—without the continental limits of the country. There are several types of naval bases—main, subsidiary, destroyer, submarine, aviation, outlying, naval station, and naval depot, each with its particular form of activity.

The 5-5-3 Ratio: See provisions of Limitations of Armament Treaty, page 125.

Scraping (Vessels of War): Under the provisions of the Treaty on Limitation of Naval Armament, the United

Continued on page 142

The Naval Controversy

The Limitation of Arms Treaty and Navy Legislation in the 68th Congress

Development of Events Since the Washington Conference

1923, Jan. 24—Mr. Butler introduced a bill (H. R. 13997) authorizing an appropriation of \$6,500,000 for elevation of guns on 13 U. S. battleships in order to increase the gun range. This bill was introduced by Mr. Butler as H. R. 14069 and reported from the House Naval Affairs Committee on January 31. The item for gun elevation was subsequently included in the third deficiency for 1923 appropriation bill (H. R. 14408) which was approved by the President March 3, 1923. (Public Law No. 543, 67th Congress.)

Mar. 15—The British ambassador at Washington, reviewing reports as to British gun elevations, declared that no alteration had been made in the elevation of turret guns of British battleships since commissioning. In subsequent communications, the British ambassador stated that Great Britain believed the elevation of turret guns was not permissible under provisions of the Treaty for Limitation of Naval Armament, and that such "reconstruction," if attempted with regard to gun elevation would tend to renew competition in naval armaments.

1924, Apr. 2—The first deficiency for 1924, appropriation bill (H. R. 7449) revealed the authorization of the appropriation for \$6,500,000 for gun elevation carried in the third deficiency bill above.

Apr. 15—Mr. Butler, introduced the bill (H. R. 8687) to authorize certain alterations to certain naval vessels and to provide for the construction of additional vessels.

Apr. 28—William B. Shearer, a writer, charged, in an article in the "New York Times" that the 5-5-3 ratio was 5-3-1, with America 1.

May 1—Mr. Britten introduced a bill (H. R. 9018) to appropriate \$6,500,000 for gun elevation. The bill was referred to the House Committee on Appropriations. The Britten bill (H. R. 10987) authorizing gun elevation for which the above amount would be appropriated, is before the House Naval Affairs Committee.

May 8—The Acting Secretary of the Navy replied to request of the Chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee, regarding the Shearer article, and placed the ratio at 5-4-3, with United States as 4, due to temporary inability of four battleships—the U. S. S. *Utah*, *Florida*, *Wyoming* and *Arkansas*—to steam at fleet speed because of boiler repairs required.

May 21—On request, the Secretary of the Navy replied to certain questions contained in H. Res. 286, stating definitely the needs of the Navy to bring it to a 5-5-3 ratio in all types of combatant ships.

June 5—The Senate passed the Butler bill (H. R. 8687) which had been passed by the House on May 28. Senator King, Utah, D., offered a motion to reconsider the vote. This motion was pending when the first session of the 68th Congress adjourned, June 7.

June 21—Secretary of the Navy Wilbur replied to the Chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee's request regarding H. R. 9018, providing for the elevation of turret guns on 13 battleships, stating that, according to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the proposed legislation was in conflict with the President's financial policy.

Sept. 6—The assembly of the League of Nations at Geneva adopted resolution for the disarmament commission of the League to study disarmament and arbitration with a view to convocation at the earliest possible moment of an international conference on armament limitation.

Oct. 2—"The Protocol of Geneva for the Pacific Settlements of International Disputes" was presented to the League of Nations, recommending an international conference for the reduction of armaments to be held at Geneva on June 15, 1925. It was provided that the Protocol must be ratified by at least a majority of the permanent members of the Council, and ten other members of the League by May 1, 1925; otherwise the disarmament conference will not be called to meet in Geneva on June 15. The Geneva Protocol specifically "makes war a crime between nations, and defines the aggressor, and establishes a peaceful means for the settlement of every international dispute that may arise."

Nov. 11—William B. Shearer, "taxpayer" of New York, served papers on Secretary of Navy to restrain him from destroying the U. S. S. *Washington* and instead, converting the *Washington* to an aircraft carrier.

Nov. 15—The Secretary of the Navy stated in his annual report to the President that ships to be scrapped under the Limitation Treaty would be disposed of by the limiting date, Feb. 17, 1925.

Nov. 25—The *Washington* was sunk off the Virginia Capes after extensive experiments with aerial and torpedo bombs and gunfire.

Dec. 8—Secretary of the Navy Wilbur before the House Committee on Naval Affairs, which was considering the Naval Appropriation Bill for 1926 (H. R. 10724), reported on the relative standing of the U. S. Navy, submitting an additional statement of the steps necessary to attain a full 5-5-3 treaty ratio in all types of combatant ships.

Dec. 8—At a regular meeting of the Council of the League of Nations at Rome, Great Britain asked for an extension of time for the considera-

tion of the ratification of the Geneva Protocol. This extension of time will enable the powers to frame any amendments or reservations as conditions precedent to ratification, although it will undoubtedly postpone the calling of the disarmament conference on June 15.

Dec. 11—The Senate voted to table the motion offered by Senator King on June 5 (first session) to reconsider the final vote on H. R. 8687.

Dec. 18—President Coolidge approved the bill (H. R. 8687). See provisions below.

Dec. 16—President Coolidge stated that he was not willing to compare the strength of the American Navy with that of any other major power, that he saw no hope for the future in competitive armament, that he was in favor of adequate armament and that he did not favor a congressional investigation of the Navy. This congressional investigation had been urged in the House of Representatives by Mr. Britten and in the Senate by Senator King.

Dec. 19—Mr. Britten introduced a bill (H. R. 10987) to advance the Naval Establishment with a view to meeting the 5-5-3 ratio promoted by the Washington Arms Conference, etc. Sections 1 and 2 of the bill provide for an increase to \$33,000,000 each in the cost of conversion of U. S. S. *Lexington* and *Saratoga* into airplane carriers, and for the construction of four scout cruisers, one air craft carrier and one floating dry dock; Section 3 of the bill authorized an appropriation of \$6,500,000 for making changes in the turret guns of 13 battleships. The bill was referred to the House Committee on Naval Affairs.

1925, Jan. 3—Mr. Butler introduced a bill (H. R. 11282) which had been drafted by the Navy Department and is similar to Section 1 of Mr. Britten's bill except that the cost of the conversion of the vessels into airplane carriers was increased to \$34,000,000 each. The bill was reported by the House Naval Affairs Committee on January 6, 1925. House Report No. 1081.

Jan. 5—Secretary of the Navy Wilbur in reply to a letter from the Committee on Naval Affairs of December 20, 1924, requesting views on the bill (H. R. 10987), stated that the proposed legislation covered by Section 1 of the bill (H. R. 10987) is not in conflict with the President's financial program, but that Sections 2 and 3 did conflict with this program.

Jan. 6—Secretary of State Hughes in a letter to the Chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee in response to a request contained in H. Res. 287 for a statement relative to objections of any foreign government in connection with the elevation of guns on certain U. S. battleships, quoted the objections of Great Britain (contained in chronology under date of March 15, 1923) and stated that the Japanese Government did not view gun elevation as a treaty violation. The Secretary stated his opinion as follows:

In view of the detailed description given by the Navy Department of the nature of the changes which would be necessary to elevate the turret guns on the capital ships retained by the United States, these changes would appear to be of a minor sort and in my opinion, would not constitute a reconstruction of the ships within the meaning which should be attributed to the provision of the naval treaty. I am of the opinion, however, that while such changes as would be contemplated in the case of American ships would not constitute a violation of the terms of the treaty, they would tend to evoke the competition which it has been the policy of this Government to mitigate. It may also be stated that, so far as the United States is concerned, the question appears to be of consequence only in relation to certain of the specified retained ships, and these ships under the replacement clauses of the treaty are to be replaced within 10 or 12 years.

Jan. 7—H. R. 10724 (passed by the House Dec. 19, 1924), making appropriations for the Navy Department for the fiscal year, ending June 30, 1926, was reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee to the Senate, with a total maintenance appropriation of \$288,845,628 and contract authorization of \$4,100,000.

Jan. 8—Secretary of Navy Wilbur, before the House Naval Affairs Committee, stated that the 5-5-3 ratio was a "yardstick" of tonnage measurement for capital ships (battleships and battle cruisers) and aircraft carriers, only; that aircraft were as yet but adjuncts to a strong fighting fleet; that a united air force was not considered advisable; that the attitude of the Navy Department was that it was desirable to maintain the same ratio on other ships that is maintained for capital ships; that the Navy Department considered, when the finances of the government and international relations justify it, the increase of gun elevation of the 13 older battleships would be a desirable improvement; and that with the U. S. S. *Florida*'s boilers replaced and the modernization of battleships as contained in H. R. 8687 completed, the 5-5-3 ratio in battleships would be restored.

Jan. 14—The Senate Committee on Naval Affairs reported with amendments the Butler bill (H. R. 9634) to provide for the creation, organiza-

tion, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve.

Jan. 16—President Coolidge stated he thought it impracticable at this time for the United States to call another disarmament conference, and would await such action as might be taken in that direction by the League of Nations.

Jan. 16—Senator King of Utah offered an amendment to the Naval Appropriation Bill 1926, requesting and authorizing the President to take steps towards calling another disarmament conference at Washington.

Jan. 16—Senator McKellar stated he would offer an amendment to Navy Appropriation Bill (H. R. 10724) for elevation of guns of 13 battleships.

Jan. 19—Senator McKellar moved to suspend the rules to make his

amendment for an appropriation of \$6,500,000 for gun elevation in order. This motion required a two-thirds vote, and was defeated, the vote being 45 to 22.

Jan. 21—The Navy Appropriation Bill passed the Senate carrying Senator King's Amendment which is as follows:

"That the President is authorized and requested to invite the governments with which the United States has diplomatic relations to send representatives to a conference to be held in the city of Washington, which shall be charged with the duty of formulating and entering into a general international agreement by which armaments for war, either upon land or sea, shall be effectually reduced and limited in the interest of the peace of the nations and the relief of all nations from the burdens of inordinate and unnecessary expenditures for the provision of armaments and the preparation for war."

Text of H. R. 8687 Authorizing Alterations and Construction of Naval Vessels

The appropriations for H. R. 8687 have not yet been made.

H. R. 8687—An Act to authorize alterations to certain naval vessels and to provide for the construction of additional vessels

Sec. 1.—Alterations are hereby authorized for the United States ships New York, Texas, Florida, Utah, Arkansas and Wyoming, to consist of the installation of additional protection against submarine attack, of the installation of anti-air attack deck protection, of the conversion of such vessels to oil burning, and, in addition, for the New York and Texas, the purchase, manufacture, and installation of new-fire-control systems, at a total cost not to exceed \$18,360,000 in all.

Sec. 2.—The President of the United States is hereby authorized to undertake prior to July 1, 1927, the construction of the vessels enumerated below: Eight scout cruisers, carrying protection and armament suited to their size and type, to have the highest practicable speed and the greatest desirable radius of action, ^{as} to cost, exclusive of armor and armament, not to exceed \$11,100,000 each; six river gunboats, to cost, exclusive of armament, not to exceed \$700,000 each: *Provided*,

That in the construction of the vessels herein enumerated the President is authorized, in his discretion, to make use of the naval ordnance plant at South Charleston, West Virginia, for the manufacture of armor and armament needed for such vessels.

Vessels to be constructed or reconditioned by this Act shall be constructed or reconditioned in the Government navy yards of the United States, when time and facilities permit and when in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy such construction or reconditioning would not involve an appreciable increase in the cost to the Government.

Sec. 3.—The alterations to capital ships and the construction of new vessels under the authorization contained in this Act shall be subject to the limitations prescribed by the treaty limiting naval armament, ratified August 17, 1923.

Sec. 4.—In the event of an international conference for the limitation of naval armaments the President is hereby empowered, in his discretion, to suspend in whole or in part any or all alterations or construction authorized in this Act.—Public Law No. 297.

Digest of Provisions of the Treaty for the Limitation of Naval Armaments

The treaty for the Limitation of Naval Armaments carries the following provisions:

(a) The total capital ship tonnage of the contracting powers shall be: United States, 525,000; British Empire, 525,000; Japan, 315,000; France, 175,000; Italy, 175,000. No capital ship shall exceed 35,000 tons, nor shall it carry a gun with a calibre in excess of 16 inches.

(b) The total aircraft carrier tonnage of the contracting powers shall be: United States, 135,000; British Empire, 135,000; Japan, 81,000; France, 60,000; Italy, 60,000. No aircraft carrier shall exceed 33,000 tons, nor shall it carry a gun with a calibre in excess of 8 inches. The number of 8-inch guns is limited to eight per ship; the number of 6-inch and guns of lesser calibre is unlimited.

(c) No vessel of war, except capital ships or aircraft carriers, exceeding 10,000 tons, shall be built by any contracting power, nor shall a vessel of war, except the classes named above, carry a gun with a calibre in excess of 8 inches.

(d) Merchant ships shall not be prepared in time of peace for war armament other than the stiffening of decks for guns of a calibre not exceeding 6 inches.

(e) Certain fortifications and naval bases specified may be maintained without increase over their status at the placing into effect of the treaty.

(f) Upon request of any contracting power, a conference to amend the Treaty may be called. The United States shall, at the end of eight years, arrange for a conference of the contracting powers to consider changes to the present Treaty.

The Treaty states in detail the method by which the capital ship ratio shall be obtained by scrapping and replacement of vessels, scrapping of excess ships to be completed by February 17, 1925.

According to the Treaty provisions capital ships and aircraft carriers of the contracting powers are limited in total tonnage to a ratio from which the simple definition of "5-5-3 ratio" has evolved.

Table Showing Relative Naval Strength of Treaty Powers

Capital Ships (Limited by Treaty)

POWER	SCRAPPED UNDER TREATY TERMS						RETAINED	
	Old Ships		New Ships		Total			
	No.	Tons	No.	Tons	No.	Tons	No.	Tons
United States.....	17	267,740	11	465,800	28	733,540	18	525,850
British Empire.....	24	500,000	None	24	500,000	20	558,950	
Japanese Empire....	10	163,312	2	80,979	12	244,290	10	301,320

Aircraft Carriers (Limited by Treaty)

POWER	BUILT		BUILDING		TOTALS		Total Tonnage allowed in Treaty
	No.	Tons	No.	Tons	No.	Tons	
United States.....	1	12,700	2	66,000	3	78,700	135,000
British Empire.....	3	48,190	3	56,300	6	104,490	135,000
Japanese Empire....	1	9,500	2	53,900	3	63,400	81,000

Light Cruisers Completed or Laid Down Since 1912

(Unlimited)

POWER	BUILT		BUILDING*		TOTALS*	
	No.		Tons		No.	
	No.	Tons	No.	Tons	No.	Tons
United States.....	9	67,500	1	7,500	10	75,000
British Empire.....	47	223,530	10	94,850	57	318,380
Japanese Empire....	18	91,440	10	79,565	28	171,005

*Authorized and appropriated for and building

Destroyer Type, First Line Vessels (Unlimited)

POWER	BUILT				BUILDING*			
	Leaders		Destroyers		Leaders		Destroyers	
	No.	Tons	No.	Tons	No.	Tons	No.	Tons
United States.....	None		288	342,086	None		None	
British Empire.....	16	27,810	183	209,315	2	3,500	2	2,700
Japanese Empire....	None		68	71,428	None		24	33,600

Fleet Submarines, First Line, Over 1,000 Tons Each; 20 Knots Plus (Unlimited)

POWER	BUILT		BUILDING*		TOTALS	
	No.		Tons		No.	
	No.	Tons	No.	Tons	No.	Tons
United States.....	3	3,318	4	6,375	7	9,693
British Empire.....	8	16,460	1	1,480	9	17,940
Japanese Empire....	1	1,400	22	34,310	23	35,710

Submarines, First Line, 700 Tons Plus, 13 Knots Plus (Unlimited)

POWER	BUILT		BUILDING*		TOTALS	
	No.		Tons		No.	
	No.	Tons	No.	Tons	No.	Tons
United States.....	44	38,386	6	5,436	50	43,822
British Empire.....	32	31,030	2	1,780	34	32,810
Japanese Empire....	36	29,764	7	6,994	43	36,758

Continued on page 143

President Coolidge Outlines the Administration's Naval Policy

UNDER the limitation of armaments treaty a large saving in outlay and a considerable decrease in maintenance of the Navy has been accomplished. We should maintain the policy of constantly working toward the full treaty strength of the Navy. Careful investigation is being made in this department of the relative importance of aircraft, surface and submarine vessels, in order that we may not fail to take advantage of all modern improvements for our national defense.

We have been constantly besought to engage in competitive armaments. Frequent reports will reach us of the magnitude of the military equipment of other nations. We shall do well to be little impressed by such reports or such actions. Any nation undertaking to maintain a military establishment with aggressive and imperialistic designs will find itself severely handicapped in the economic development of the world. I believe thoroughly in the Army and Navy, in adequate defense and preparation. But I am opposed to any policy of competition in building and maintaining land or sea armaments.

Our country has definitely relinquished the old standard of dealing with other countries by terror and force, and is definitely committed to the new standard of dealing with them through friendship and understanding. This new policy should be constantly kept in mind by the guiding forces of the Army and Navy, by the Congress and by the country at large. I believe it holds a promise of great benefit to humanity. I shall resist any attempt to resort to the old methods and the old standards. I am specially solicitous

that foreign nations should comprehend the candor and sincerity with which we have adopted this position. While we propose to maintain defensive and supplementary police forces by land and sea, and to train them through inspections and maneuvers upon appropriate occasions in order to maintain their efficiency, I wish every other nation to understand that this does not express any unfriendliness or convey any hostile intent. I want the armed forces of America to be considered by all peoples not as enemies but as friends, as the contribution which is made by this country for the maintenance of the peace and security of the world.

Many times I have expressed my desire to see the work of the Washington Conference on Limitation of Armaments appropriately supplemented by further agreements for a further reduction and for the purpose of diminishing the menace and waste of the competition in preparing instruments of international war. It has been and is my expectation that we might hopefully approach other great powers for further conference on this subject as soon as the carrying out of the present reparation plan as the established and settled policy of Europe has created a favorable opportunity. But on account of proposals which have already been made by other governments for a European conference, it will be necessary to wait to see what the outcome of their actions may be. I should not wish to propose or have representatives attend a conference which would contemplate commitments opposed to the freedom of action we desire to maintain unimpaired with respect to our purely domestic policies.—*Extracts, see 6, p. 143.*

Secretary Wilbur Reviews the Naval Situation

THE great accomplishment of the Limitation of Naval Armament agreement was not in the fixing of a definite ratio of ships with its attendant economies, but in effecting an agreement making aggressive warfare across the ocean more difficult. That agreement made it impossible for any one of the great powers of the world to make a successful invasion across the Atlantic or Pacific.

The purpose of this government in calling the disarmament conference was to terminate competitive building programs and to manifest its willingness to waive a preponderating navy, to limit armament by agreement and to accept a reasonable ratio with all other powers as to ships retained. To do this it was necessary that we should scrap ships already building which upon completion would have given us a preponderance in naval armament or that we should complete those ships and agree that the other powers should complete similar proportionate construction, thus increasing instead of decreasing the armament of all signatory powers. As a matter of fact a middle course was adopted.

The most difficult problem of the conference on Limitation of Armament was that of fixing the relative strength or ratio of the contracting powers. The representatives of this government proposed that the ratio should be determined by the relative tonnage of capital ships built and building, and that as to the latter allowance should be made for such proportion of the total tonnage of the completed ship as was represented by the percentage of completion, that is to say, a 33,000 ton ship fifty per cent completed was counted as 16,500. This plan gave to this government the benefit of its expenditures for capital ships built and building. It was upon this basis and by this method that it was agreed that the tonnage of Great Britain and of the

United States should be approximately equal, and of Japan should be sixty per cent thereof, or more accurately, Great Britain 558,950 (including four battle cruisers), America 525,850, Japan 301,320 (including four battle cruisers).

Each signatory power has carried out with scrupulous exactness the Treaty provisions.

The question we are confronted with now is whether we shall continue to maintain a navy adequate for the protection of our international lines of communication and of our great coastal and international commerce. It is evident that we will continue to demand full protection of our commerce in the future as we have done in the past. A systematic adherence to the full Treaty ratio not only with reference to the ships covered by the Treaty but with reference to all branches of the naval service will reasonably assure such protection.

In view of the fact that enormous expansion of a navy of any power along lines permitted by the Limitation of Naval Armament Treaty would have the effect of destroying that ratio and that the only present method of keeping up the ratio is by competitive shipbuilding along such lines, it is obvious that an agreement limiting within reasonable bounds the exercise of this right would be desirable for all powers concerned. Until such international agreement is entered into, the only method of maintaining the Treaty ratio of our respective fleets will be by a building program commensurate with that of the other signatory powers. In such case the very absence of an agreement with reference to such vessels makes our policy dependent upon that of the other powers and these powers by the expansion of their navy can virtually determine the extent to which we must build up our navy if we are to maintain the ratio.—*Extracts, see 7, p. 143.*

Is Our Navy Up To Full Treaty Strength?

Pro

Hon. Burton L. French

U. S. Representative, Idaho, Republican

THOSE who say that the United States is not maintaining her proper parity in the 5-5-3 ratio seem unable to take a comprehensive view of the whole situation, and they make their deductions upon the basis of a limited number of factors and some of the critics have not been accurate as to the factors which they have discussed.

One of the criticisms that has been made against our Navy refers to naval bases and oil-storage capacity. The British Isles and Japan have practically no fuel-oil resources. These two great nations are absolutely dependent upon their storage capacity at home for the maintenance of any degree of efficiency as naval world powers.

Not so the United States. The United States produced in 1923 approximately 735,000,000 barrels of crude oil.

I am speaking only of that which we produced within our homeland. Our producers and refiners have storage capacity aggregating more than 328,299,000 barrels in crude oil and additional storage capacity of more than 33,000,000 barrels of fuel oil exclusive of naval storage and exclusive of oil storage capacity provided for oil that is imported from foreign countries. This storage capacity in event of war would be available for our country.

Turning to coal, the United States last year produced 494,772,000 metric tons, and Great Britain produced 228,971,000, and Japan 28,000,000.

Much has been said touching the importance of elaborate naval bases for the United States. We need establishments that we may keep our ships in repair and we need storage capacity for a reasonable amount of supplies, but we are in such adequate condition that all future development may happily proceed with moderation.

Here again, so far as Great Britain is concerned, a different situation presents itself. The United States is compact. The possessions of Great Britain are far flung. That the people of the British Empire may be able to keep contact with themselves Great Britain must have free use of the seas and must have naval bases, including naval supplies in vast quantities in widely separated parts of the Empire.

The United States leads the world in essential food products, in coal, in petroleum, in iron ore, in pig iron, and steel, produces an abundant supply of copper and lead and lumber and wool and cotton; and in fact, would be abundantly self-sustaining were she to be cut off forever from every other nation.

This can not be said of the British Isles, nor can it be said of Japan.

I am not in accord at all with the statement that to-day our Navy is 4 in comparison with 5 for Great Britain and 3 for Japan. I am for the bill (H. R. 8687) not because at the present time there is a divergence in the 5-5-3 ratio, but because I do not want a divergence to occur in another three years or four years.

I hope that before there shall be an opportunity to complete this program, or even to begin it, there may be another limitation conference, and that we may have an understanding touching cruisers, touching destroyers, touching types of ships not recognized in the present treaty. Until that conference can be attained, I believe it is our duty to look ahead, to anticipate, and to provide a program for the future that will maintain the ratio that now exists.—*Extracts, see 4, p. 143.*

Con

Hon. John Jacob Rogers

U. S. Representative, Massachusetts, Republican

THE NAVAL limitation treaty of 1922 established the 5-5-3 ratio for capital ships and aircraft carriers only. Is the United States Navy up to the treaty ratio? At the present time, no.

Thirteen of our eighteen battleships were completed before the World War. In that war the increasing effectiveness of aircraft and submarines was demonstrated. Additional protection is needed by capital ships. An armored deck should be provided as defense against bombs dropped from aircraft and from high angle gun fire from other ships. Underwater "blisters" should be added to minimize the damage which might result from torpedo or mine attacks. These modernization features are expressly permitted by the naval limitation treaty.

The Butler Act, (H. R. 8687) recently passed by Congress, and signed by the President, authorizes some of the necessary changes, but no appropriations have yet been made to begin the work.

Even after deck armor, underwater protection and new boilers have been provided, there will still be the matter of gun range, in which we are inferior to the British.

Considering our navy as a whole:

At the time of the Limitation of Armament Conference both the British Empire and the Japanese Empire were superior to the United States in completed modern cruisers, and since the conference have continued to increase their cruiser strength.

For many years prior to the World War the United States had concentrated on building capital ships, realizing that the primary element of a navy second to none is a battleship fleet second to none. These battleships gave our statesmen an attentive hearing at the arms conference. While building these ships we had deferred building cruisers; but other powers, notably the British and Japanese empires, built cruisers concurrently with battleships, so that now they have an overwhelming superiority in cruisers. Twenty 10,000 ton cruisers are now required to bring our cruiser tonnage to the treaty ratio for capital ships of the British Empire and twenty-two cruisers are required to bring our cruiser tonnage to equal the ratio of 5-3 of Japanese cruiser tonnage, even if their existing tonnage is not augmented.

The Butler Act, just passed, authorizes eight 10,000-ton light cruisers of the twenty or twenty-two needed. But as stated, appropriations are necessary before construction can begin.

With reference to our apparent preponderance in destroyers over the British (288 to 201), it should be noted that a large proportion of United States destroyers are tied up and fast becoming obsolete.

In submarine tonnage, built and building, the United States is on a practical equality with Japan, instead of being two-thirds stronger, as measured by the treaty ratio. Of the U. S. submarines, 43 are from 485 to 569 tons; while of the 74 Japanese boats not one is less than 689 tons, and 63 are over 900 tons. So that of our 76,388 tons as compared with Japan's 75,413 tons, 56 only of our boats are comparable in size with her 74. Japan has 41 submarines building or projected, 23 of which are over 1,000 tons. That means they can cruise long distances. Eleven were completed in 1922-23. The United States has only one

Continued on page 142

The Question of Gun Elevation

Pro

Hon. Fred A. Britten

U. S. Representative, Illinois, Republican

I REGARD the elevation of guns on our first-line ships of greater importance than any other modernization possible.

Eight of our 18 ships have slower speed and shorter range than anything in the British or Japanese navies.

A simple change in gun elevation to 30 degrees will instantly make powerful hitters out of present weaklings.

America demands a Navy equal to the best and if the treaty of equalization is in fact a delusion we might just as well know all about it.

It is quite obvious that in a fleet action all the vessels of a fleet can not be firing upon the enemy until the enemy is under fire by the ship of shortest range. In such a fleet action we would have seven ships that could fire slightly over 20,000 yards, whereas the ships of shortest range in the British fleet could fire 23,800 yards, giving them an advantage of practically 2 miles. In other words, if the British remained at a range just equal to their shortest-ranged ships, the fire of over a third of our ships could not reach them and this would automatically reduce the size of our fleet by one-third.

Expressed in the terms of elevation of guns, the 13 ships of the United States Navy have a designed elevation of 15 and 18 degrees, whereas none of the 22 ships of the British Navy has less than 20 degrees, thus leaving the American ships much inferior in this regard to those of Great Britain.

The change in elevation of our guns will not in any way contravene the spirit or letter of the treaty for the limitation of naval armaments.

At the time the Congress was unintentionally misinformed by our Navy Department and the appropriation of \$6,500,000 made it did not take long for the British Government to inform our Government that elevation of the guns of the British fleet was not being increased, and we immediately and unhesitatingly accepted the British statement. They so outranged us that this was not necessary.

When one realizes that 13 of our 18 battleships are outranged by every big gun on each of the 22 British first-line ships he is, of course, amazed and startled, but when he further comprehends that none of our ships have a speed greater than 21 knots an hour and 14 of the British ships have speed ranging from 22 to 30 knots, he begins to wonder what would happen to us in so uneven a conflict as here presents itself.

And this situation will get worse for us rather than better as time goes by, for the British now have authorized and building the battleships *Rodney* and *Nelson*, each of 35,000 tons, which are authorized under the Washington treaty to take the place of the four oldest battleships now on the British Register, beginning with the *Thunderer*, completed in 1912. When these two first-line fighters are commissioned the British will have 20 first-line ships against our 18, and all but 3 of the 20 will have a much greater speed than any of our ships.

This means that with longer-ranged guns and ships of greater speed the British could do to us just what they did to Germany off the coast of South America when they selected their distances at which the Germans could not fire back, and they literally blew them out of the water without a single British casualty.—*Extracts, see 4, p. 143.*

Con

Thomas S. Butler

U. S. Representative, Pennsylvania, Republican

THE question of elevation of the guns on thirteen of our capital ships is one that involves an interpretation of the naval treaty, on which the State Department has expressed its opinion.

Secretary Hughes has expressed himself unequivocally against the elevation of the guns and in that position he has been supported by the President. He takes the ground that although in his opinion these changes could be made without technical violation of the treaty, they would tend to evoke the competition which it has been the policy of this government to mitigate.

Secretary Hughes also pointed out that the ships in question under the replacement clauses of the treaty are to be replaced within ten or twelve years. Thus the changes made would be effective only during the period of the ten-year naval holiday, or very shortly thereafter.

What are the actual facts concerning the range of the guns? A comparison of tables showing the capital ships of the United States and Great Britain, with size, elevation and range of guns, shows that at the time of the signing of the treaty five of our ships had an elevation of 30°; the remaining thirteen ships had an elevation of only 15°. These are the ones in which the change is contemplated. None of the British ships has an elevation of less than 20°. The new battle cruiser "*Hood*" is the only one that has an elevation of 30°. These tables further disclose that our five ships with 30° elevation and a range of 34,500 yards outrange any of the British ships, even the "*Hood*," which has a range of only 30,300 yards, by over 4,000 yards. We have three more battleships with ranges of 24,000 yards which are outranged by thirteen of the British ships by not more than 300 to 800 yards, a difference that is negligible, and two more whose range is 23,500 yards. The six ships with the lowest range of 21,000 yards are outranged by the corresponding nine of the British ships by only 2,800 yards, a difference which is not so great as the difference at the head of the line.

If the guns on our thirteen ships are elevated to 30°, all of our ships will outrange all other capital ships authorized by the treaty to be retained by Great Britain. This would be true even if the elevation of the guns on the British ships were increased to 30°, the maximum. It was admitted by Secretary Wilbur when he recently appeared before the House Committee on Naval Affairs that the elevation of the guns would greatly increase the fighting efficiency of the ships. Is it not reasonable to assume that all these factors were taken into consideration at the limitation conference—five of our ships being of greater range than any of Great Britain's ships, and all of Great Britain's ships being of greater range than thirteen of ours? Does not this seem a more equitable arrangement than for us to modify our ships so that not only five but all of them would outrange all of the British ships, and thus outclass them as fighting machines?

Under these circumstances it is clear that it would be most unwise of Congress to again authorize elevation of the guns when such action might seriously embarrass both the President and the State Department, should the President decide to invite the nations to another conference for the purpose of placing a limitation on naval vessels not covered

Continued on page 139

Does the Passage of H. R. 8687 Start a New Race in Armament?

Pro

Hon. James V. McClintic

U. S. Representative, Oklahoma, Democrat

I OPPOSED the completion of the 1916 building program at the conclusion of the war with Germany, notwithstanding that the representatives of the Navy and the members of the Naval Affairs Committee voted to finish all of the ships which have since been scrapped. When the Disarmament Conference was proposed, I left my party long enough to vote for this authorization, feeling that the time had come when civilized nations should stop their mad race to see who could build the strongest navy.

The tonnage of the ships scrapped by the terms of the conference amounts to 784,000. Many of these ships were 80 per cent completed, and the net loss to this Government amounts to over \$1,000,000,000, yet there are those who apparently have no confidence in the results of the Disarmament Conference, and they are here today with legislation calling for the construction of ships that will cost over \$100,000,000. Who knows but in the next conference between nations some of these same ships, if authorized, may be ordered to the scrap heap.

In the Senate at this time there is pending a plan for the bringing about of the creating of a "world's court." If this World Court becomes a reality, then it will have or should have jurisdiction over all questions of this kind. If our Nation is to take the leading part, as it has in the past, surely we want to go into the same with clean hands, so that it can not be said that we were quietly building all of the various kinds of ships that were not covered in the last disarmament conference.

I am not in favor of a law that will cause the nations who participated in the conference to feel that the United States is trying to obtain an advantage in its Navy. This propaganda about our ratio in comparison with the other countries does not appeal to me. I have confidence in the integrity and honor of those who represented us in the disarmament conference, and until they publicly admit that they were not able to cope with the representatives of the other countries and that we got the worst of the bargain, I can not change my position.

I do not propose to increase the burden of taxation on the people when they are clamoring for the kind of relief that will enable them to provide food and clothing for their families. I have faith in the men that represented us in the great disarmament conference. Their honesty and ability has never been questioned, and I do not propose by my vote to help start the machinery which may again cause the nations of the world to vie with each other to see who can build the largest navy.—*Extracts, see 4, p. 143.*

Hon. Ralph F. Lozier

U. S. Representative, Missouri, Democrat

IT IS contended that extensive alterations must be made in six of our great battleships to maintain their efficiency as fighting units. The proponents of this bill say that we must keep our Navy on a parity with the navy of Great Britain. There is such a diversity of opinion between the experts that no one can with assurance state that the British Navy excels ours in fighting efficiency. Some of our heavy battleships are far superior to any ships of that class in the British Navy. Some of our battleships have a longer range than any of the English battleships.

Continued on page 143

Con

Hon. Philip D. Swing

U. S. Representative, California, Republican

THERE is no reasonable foundation for saying that the passage of H. R. 8687 starts a new race in armaments. The Act authorizes three distinct things. First, alterations and repairs to six of our capital ships. Second, construction of six river gun boats. Third, the building of eight new scout cruisers.

The first proposal can not be held to be a step in an armament race, because it relates only to existing battleships whose numbers can not be increased, and the changes proposed are expressly restricted and limited to those contemplated and permitted by the Limitation of Armament Treaty.

The provision for the river gun boats relates solely to our Yangtze River patrol for the protection of our missionaries and traders in China from bandits and outlaws. These boats are not even sea-going vessels, and could not, under any conceivable stretch of the imagination, be held to constitute a challenge to or threat against any Nation in the World.

This leaves for serious discussion only the authorization of the eight new scout cruisers. The Limitation of Armament Treaty was drawn by wise men in the interests of Peace. The 5-5-3 ratio was not the result of barter or chance. It was arrived at after profound study which fixed it as the scientific ratio which would give to each Nation concerned a decided advantage in defending its own shore, but a decided disadvantage if it undertook to attack another. That is, each Nation was permitted a Navy adequate and sufficient to successfully defend itself, but insufficient to successfully attack one of the others. The very best guarantee of peace for the World is for each of these Nations to maintain a Navy based on the Treaty ratio. While the Treaty imposes an express limitation only on battleships and airplane carriers, yet our Nation, recognizing the spirit of the treaty, has, quite properly, accepted it as our guide in reference to all other classes of ships.

The legislation under consideration in no wise violates the spirit of that Treaty. We now have, built and building, ten cruisers with a total displacement of 75,000 tons. The British Empire has, built and building, 55 cruisers with a total tonnage of 298,000. While Japan has, built and building, 28 cruisers, with a total tonnage of 170,000. The eight new cruisers we propose to build will give us all together only eighteen ships of this class with a total tonnage of 155,000, which is less than Japan and only about one-half of that of Great Britain. To bring our cruiser class to the 5-5-3 ratio established for the battleships, we would have to build twenty-two to equal Great Britain, or twenty-one to give us the required 5-3 ratio with Japan. Therefore no one can say that this program is a challenge for a race with any Nation, because it still leaves Great Britain and Japan well in the lead in this class of ships.

We are proposing to build these eight new scout cruisers, not as a challenge to any other Nation, but because we badly need these cruisers to round out and balance our fleet. When the war came on we dropped our battleship and cruiser building program at the request of our Allies to devote our energy to building destroyers in order to win the submarine fight. Our fleet as it stands today is lacking in auxiliary vessels. According to best naval strategy a fleet with the

Continued on page 141

Do We Need a Strong Navy to Accomplish Further Naval Reduction Among Nations?

Pro

Hon. Carl Vinson

U. S. Representative, Georgia, Democrat

ASSUMING that a conference to bring about further limitation of competitive building is to be called in the future, what should be this Government's policy with reference to our Navy? Shall we adopt the policy of sitting quietly by and refusing to legislate to take proper care of this arm of our national defense by the refusal to enact the necessary legislation to make changes and authorizations to keep our fleet up to the highest state of efficiency, when it is a well-known fact that some of our capital ships are far behind their foreign counterparts? Shall we permit our Navy to fall below the ratio agreed upon at the Washington conference? If we hope to achieve the desired aim of prohibiting competitive building among the maritime nations, it is absolutely imperative and necessary to enter the conference with a strong and powerful Navy.

If, upon the calling of an international conference in the near future, the United States enters the same below the ratio fixed by the powers at the Washington conference, it is very probable that other nations would readily take the position, and with considerable weight to their argument, that, as we had not maintained the ratio of 5-5-3 but had permitted our Navy to fall below it, therefore the ratio fixed at the conference was more than this country needed or required for its adequate defense and was a larger ratio than Congress required that it should be.

Why was it possible at the Washington conference for this Nation to take the leading role and bring about the agreement with reference to capital ships, battle cruisers, and airplane carriers? It was solely because at that time we were carrying out the 1916 building program and had on the ways 15 of the finest ships ever devised. It was a well-known fact that by 1925 we would have possessed about twice as large and effective a tonnage as that of any other Nation. The shadows of the rising Navy of the United States were already robbing some other nations of the tinsel of former centuries.

We were able to reach a successful agreement to reduce naval armament because we had a large naval armament ourselves. Our opinion commanded respect. If we had possessed a smaller Navy, if we had abandoned our building program before the conference was called, in all probability the other countries would not have listened to our opinion.—*Extracts, see 4, p. 143.*

Luke McNamee

Captain, U. S. N.

WE ARE a nation potentially powerful on account of our resources, but the prestige that we will enjoy beyond our own borders will be measured by the visible evidence of our strength.

I sat in Paris in the Peace Conference, and I saw the four strongest military powers write a treaty while all the weak powers waited outside to sign on the dotted line when that treaty was completed. I sat in Washington during the Arms Conference, and saw the great naval powers of the world gladly gather there to agree with us that naval armaments should be limited and that other beneficent treaties should be signed. And I thought, why is it that Switzerland

Continued on page 141

Con

Hon. Edward W. Pou

U. S. Representative, North Carolina, Democrat

IN PURSUANCE of our agreement in the Disarmament Conference we have scrapped 787,940 tons of our Naval Establishment. During the current year we have appropriated approximately \$300,000,000 for the maintenance and building of the Navy, and now it is proposed to add \$111,000,000 to that \$300,000,000, making a total for the year of \$411,000,000. We are told that this bill is necessary in order to be ready for the next conference. If we must appropriate \$111,000,000 more to get ready for the next disarmament conference the conference is doomed to failure and defeat before it is called together.

I would rather go in that conference not having appropriated this immense sum of money; I would rather to go into such conference conscious that we are living up to our profession that we, at least, are not adding to the great Navy we already have. If we could say we stand for peace—we have scrapped 787,000 tons and we have not replaced a ton—I think we would stand a better chance of success.

Anybody can prove that we have got to have a very great Navy at any time. For 23 years it has been proven annually on this floor that we were actually approaching war. We have an annual war scare here every time a great naval appropriation bill comes up for consideration. Talk about a 5-5-3 Navy! Why 5-5-3? Do you want to sail out on the Atlantic or Pacific Oceans and engage in a drawn battle? That is what 5-5 means. If we are going to enter the race of naval construction, why let us have an unconquerable Navy. That is the logic of the situation. If we are going to enter into such race, it is not only our duty to have a Navy as great as that of Great Britain but a Navy even greater than that of Great Britain. Why stop at the 5-5 ratio?

Five-five means either side may win. There is certainly no assurance of success if war comes with a 5-5 ratio. To take \$111,000,000 out of the Treasury at this time is a crime against the American people.

What is the world's situation to-day? The question throughout most of the world outside of the United States is how can the people get something to eat, and yet gentlemen talk seriously about the danger of a naval attack. Who is there, pray, who wants to attack America? Who is there in a position to attack us if they had such desire? Excepting America, almost the entire world is bankrupt. Very few nations can obtain credit and all currency is depreciated in value by comparison, and yet we are told that unless we appropriate \$111,000,000 in addition to the \$300,000,000 we are not doing our duty and unless we make the appropriation we leave our country exposed to the danger of attack. We are asked to appropriate \$111,000,000 additional in order to be ready to meet the attack of some nation which cherishes a desire to engage in war with America.

I would rather go into the coming conference, and I pray devoutly that another conference may be called, conscious that I was right, that I had not played false, than to have \$111,000,000 or \$111,000,000,000 appropriated to strengthen the Navy. I believe America is the one nation which can take any steps deemed necessary for disarmament. In a bankrupt world with America the only nation

Continued on page 141

Should the U. S. Navy Stand Still Though Other Navies Are Increased?

Pro

Hon. Henry B. Steagall

U. S. Representative, Alabama, Democrat

I DO NOT subscribe to the proposition that the United States shall subordinate its judgment and its conscience in a matter affecting the peace of the world or have its course determined by any other nation or any community of nations. I think the United States ought to lead the nations of the earth, both by teaching and by example. I think the United States should—and I venture to say some time it will—resume its place as the leader of the moral forces throughout the world. The disarmament conference was not called to commit the United States to any particular program of military preparedness. The thing for which the conference was called—and for which it was commended—was the attempt to place a limit on other nations and to check, if possible, the orgy of waste and competition in which nations were engaged in the mad rush for military ascendancy. We committed the United States to a limitation, not to a pledge. It was never contemplated that we should lose a billion dollars in scrapping vessels to bring our Navy inside the limit of the treaty provisions and then turn around and begin at once a construction program expending \$150,000,000, as provided in the bill (H. R. 8687.) Such a course discredits before the world our entire disarmament conference and its work. Gentlemen tell us this is necessary in order that we may have a "balanced Navy." My answer to that is that if our Navy is now unbalanced the fact is due to our having followed the same experts whose advice we are asked to take now, because they have guided our action all along.

We are spending now nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars annually on our Military Establishment. This is more than three times the amount spent on our Army and Navy annually prior to 1916. This vast sum of nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars is being assessed against the American people in addition to the stupendous debt resting on the Government as the result of the Great War, which was fought to end wars. I have never voted to place these unnecessary and indefensible burdens on the American people in time of peace and I will not do so now. In this connection I want to ask what has become of the cry for economy that has been ringing throughout the land in recent months? Where are the champions of the taxpayers?

If the recent war taught us anything, it taught us that any great conflict that may come in the future between any great nations is bound to be a conflict of resources and finances. Any government that goes into a great war with its credit crippled will have real cause for alarm. Any government that enters a great war with taxation problems engendering strife and ill will and class hatreds and controversies, with a divided and dissatisfied people, will be handicapped, if not whipped to start with.

If we want really to prepare for war, let us pay our debts, set our house in order, and reestablish the faith of the citizen in the Government and his devotion to our institutions. No nation has ever declared war against us, and none is likely to do so for many years to come. We hold the purse strings of the world, and this gives us a power that will take care of the situation in the immediate future, even should serious disputes arise.

If we can adhere to the ideals of simplicity and economy

Continued on page 142

Con

Walter Bruce Howe

Vice-President, Navy League of the United States

OURS is not the world's largest Navy and our Government has shown our willingness not to race for that position. This much is good in the cause of economy and international trust, but we must keep our Navy equal to the needs of our position. We have faith in our righteousness and we know it must be clothed with power.

The United States is a maritime country. Its commerce is huge and extends everywhere. It is the richest country. Its aspirations are just and its dealings are fair. For such a nation to assume a minor rule would be a calamity to the world and incidentally such an attitude would be an hypocrisy. A strong Navy is needed to safeguard our existence, growth and leadership. For we know that no great maritime power has survived as a leading nation after its Navy was insufficient to protect its commerce. Spain, Portugal and the Netherlands fell back when their navies were over-matched.

Beside victory or defeat in battle other matters of importance depend on naval strength—matters which arise in times of peace. Commerce creates rivalry and it demands just treatment abroad. Our citizens in other countries must be protected. Thus situations and incidents arise which require adjustment through the Department of State. There is no escape from the conclusion that such adjustments are reached with success and cause the minimum of friction and ill-will because both sides know we have a strong Navy. Our representatives do not have to mention it.

One nation sometimes threatens injustice to another and the fundamental purpose of the Monroe Doctrine is to avoid aggression in this hemisphere and prevent collisions with Europe. The Monroe Doctrine depends on our Naval strength.

In the very cause of Limitation of Armament the effect of Naval strength was predominant. In the Washington Conference most of the important decisions were made by the United States, England and Japan while France and Italy, both great countries but relatively weak on the sea, were relatively in the background.

Since the Washington Conference other great powers have greatly increased their actual and authorized tonnage in unlimited classes. For us to stand still while others are advancing is equivalent to our independent reduction.

The other great powers refused to reduce or limit their strength in light cruisers, destroyers, submarines and aircraft, when they had the opportunity to do so under the protection of a solemn agreement. It is not likely that any of them now, and without the safeguard of an all embracing agreement, will sink a ship or limit their naval construction to match our example.

As it is, England and Japan could give up much of their material in these classes and still be stronger in them than our Navy. Our destroyer tonnage does not compensate this disparity. Observers of the Washington Conference who note the success in limiting capital ships in which we were superior and our failure to secure limitation in classes where superiority lay with others, conclude that we cannot now achieve greater success in limitation by permitting greater inferiority in armament.

Continued on page 143

Should the Treaty Ratio Be Maintained Ship for Ship?

Pro

W. L. Rodgers

Rear Admiral, U. S. N. (Retired)

THIS country is rich and prosperous beyond all others. It is patent every day that other countries are jealous of us and wish to share our prosperity (at our expense).

Too many of our people complacently believe that we may trust our fortune to the good will and forbearance of less prosperous but envious people. We must not deceive ourselves. It is a mistake to think that much good will exists between nations; there is rather a polite tolerance, not substantial example to endure when interests are clashing. And then, it is only upon our owned armed strength to repel aggression that we may safely rely. It is vain to think that national agreements to do and to leave undone certain things will long endure after the original economic and political conditions alter.

In regard to fundamental treaties affecting our sovereign rights we may be sure that if we expect them to be kept, after they begin to put the other party at a disadvantage we must have the treaty strength to compel their observance or withdraw. It is folly to believe that our riches protect us, they are a danger.

The United States has a large foreign commerce on which our prosperity depends. If that commerce is hindered, the prosperity of the people is reduced or destroyed. For its protection in peace and war we must have a navy so strong that no ill-wisher will venture to threaten the nation through controlling her commerce.

At the close of the world war, we were building a great navy which would have made us secure, but we called a conference to discuss reduction of armaments and to settle disputed points in the political affairs of the Pacific. The American delegates proposed limitation on all classes of ships but as concluded the treaty limited only the great ships in which class our superiority lay. These we destroyed, and left the other nations free in the cheaper classes.

To obtain even this accord we are obliged in addition to sacrifice our right to strengthen our fortified bases in the western Pacific on which must rest our naval strength for the defense of our commerce and intercourse with Asia. Further, the political treaty of accord which was meant to settle the causes of friction in the Far East (although the Japanese refused to permit consideration of their position in Manchuria) has not yet been put in force. This country made the sacrifices. There were no reciprocal concessions of importance by others.

Senator Lodge, one of the American delegates, said of the Conference that it was an experiment in good will. So far, it has not proved itself successful. How can we hope for more good will by still further limiting our naval strength?

If we are to present that position in the world which we believe we now command; if we are not to become internationally negligible, we must be strong enough to command forbearance.

By the present treaty, other nations are free to build what ships they desire and the treaty requires it to be in small units suiting their finances. We also should build what we think our policies require in view of other nations actions.

As we made concessions in the last treaty, let some other nation, who needs limitation more than we do, call the next conference and make the concessions necessary to reach agreement.

Con

Frederick J. Libby

Executive Secy., Natl. Council for Prevention of War

THE official tables prepared by the Navy Department comparing the British and Japanese Navies with our own show that we have 309 destroyers with a total tonnage of 357,668; the British Empire has, built, building and projected, 209 destroyers with a total tonnage of 247,525; Japan has, built, building and projected, 104 destroyers with a total tonnage of 112,878. Our destroyers already built almost equal the combined destroyers built, building and projected of the British Empire and Japan.

We have 88 submarines as against 35 belonging to the British Empire and 36 belonging to Japan. Built, building and projected, we are credited with 99 submarines with a total tonnage of 76,388; the British Empire with 41 and a total tonnage of 47,720; Japan with 73 (part of them not laid down) and a total tonnage of 73,713.

With this superiority in two important elements of naval strength, the question before us is whether we shall also match England ship for ship in cruisers, flotilla leaders, fleet submarines (a special type), etc., and at the same time see to it that for every three ships of any of these or other types which Japan has, we should have 5.

Such a policy would give America enormous superiority in the fleet as a whole. The other powers would not permit America to obtain such superiority. A race in armaments, enormously costly, would be instituted. The initial program would contemplate an expenditure of over a billion dollars and, as the race waxed hotter, there would be no calculable limit to the annual expenditure.

Congressman French, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations, December 17, 1924, interpreted the Treaty as establishing a maximum and not a minimum, that is, "that our country shall not exceed the ratio fixed; what we may do under the maximum rests with the good judgment of the United States."

The pretense that we are under some obligation to maintain parity with England or a 5-3 ratio with Japan, is the most obvious sort of propaganda. The obligation is that we honorably observe the Washington Treaties in spirit and in letter. Competitive building of auxiliary ships is a clear violation of the spirit of the Conference, whose purpose was to stop competitive building.

The further argument is by no means contemptible that naval vessels are or may soon be as obsolete as bows and arrows.

Why, therefore, we should be asked excitedly to race with our friends, England and Japan, in this particular form of military defense and attack, is difficult for a layman to understand. It would be utterly inexplicable were it not for the fact that men make money by building these costly relics of a past age and are able to spend enormous sums on propaganda.

It is protection from war itself that is imperatively needed under modern conditions, and armaments have never protected any great power from war. President Coolidge and Secretary Hughes have been stressing the fact in recent months that protection from war lies in an altogether different realm. Active friendliness and a willingness to be just are the first line of defense against war.

The 5-5-3 ratio that we must maintain at any cost is in

Continued on page 139

Did the U. S. Benefit By the Washington Conference?

Pro

Raymond Leslie Buell

Instructor in Government, Harvard University

DESPITE the fact that the United States was in a position to outstrip any other power in a race for armaments because of its great resources there were many imperative reasons why naval competition should end. The most obvious was financial. In view of increased costs it was estimated that the tremendous sum of \$1,500,000,000 would be necessary to complete the 1916 building program. The total sum appropriated for naval expenditures in the 1921-1922 budgets of the five powers which met in the Washington Conference, came to the tremendous figure of \$1,300,000,000, a sum twice as large as the endowment of all the universities, colleges and professional schools in the United States, and three times as great as the cost of the Panama Canal.

But even a stronger reason for disarmament was that such "extravagant expense" was "a constant menace to the peace of the world rather than an assurance of its preservation." The theory that large armaments are necessary to preserve peace was exploded by the last war. Armaments serve merely to disturb peace. If nations feverishly construct great battleships and conscript great armies, it is certain that some time they will be used.

It is certain that eventually the British Empire would have answered the challenge of the "big navy" men in the United States. In fact, naval competition was the chief reason why England clung to the Anglo-Japanese Alliance. That instrument made a unit out of the navies of England and Japan which the United States could not outdistance for years to come. Obviously, the struggle of the United States with Great Britain and Japan for the domination of the world would destroy civilization. But such a struggle could be forestalled only by checking naval competition.

As a result of the Naval Treaty, adopting the 5-5-3 ratio and the nonfortification agreement, it is now impossible for any power to intervene successfully in the Orient by force, if acting alone. By the Four-Power Treaty, it is now impossible for Great Britain and the United States to combine their fleets in order to intervene jointly. Moreover, by the Four-Power Treaty the freedom of the United States and Great Britain to bring diplomatic pressure against Japan is also probably limited. Consequently, as long as these Treaties are adhered to, Japan is absolutely supreme in the eastern Pacific and over Asia.

At the same time, the Naval Treaty has made a successful Japanese attack on the Pacific Coast impossible, because Japan, as far as capital ships are concerned, will have a fleet forty percent inferior to the American fleet; because Japan has no real bases or fortifications in the Pacific this side of the Bonins; and because the United States retains the right to increase the fortifications in Hawaii. As a result of this Treaty, it has become a physical impossibility for the United States successfully to attack Japan and Japan to attack the United States.

These agreements, so far as England and the United States are concerned, have also removed the possibility of war. They have nipped in the bud an impending struggle for the supremacy of the seas; and they have cancelled the Anglo-Japanese Alliance. These results have brought the English-speaking peoples of the world together more closely than ever before.—*Extracts, see 3, pp. 143.*

Con

Dudley W. Knox

Captain, U. S. N., Retired

REGARDED purely from a naval viewpoint the answer to this question is bound to be negative, without any reservations. An affirmative answer can be justified only on grounds related to international politics.

At his opening address to the Conference Mr. Hughes proposed a general "scrapping" program of capital ships and a future limitation which was to be applied to *all* types of naval vessels. The United States then had a great preponderance of capital ship strength on the eve of completion, which no other nation could match except after a delay of several years and at an expenditure of money that could not possibly be afforded by them. On the other hand we had an embarrassing deficiency of light cruisers as compared with other countries. In his address Mr. Hughes informed the Conference that "The United States is now completing its program of 1916 calling for ten new battleships and six battle cruisers. One battleship has been completed. The others are in various stages of construction; in some cases from 60 to over 80 percent of the construction has been done. On these 15 capital ships now being built over \$330,000,000 has been spent. Still, the United States is willing in the interest of an immediate limitation of naval armament to scrap all these ships." The cost of the work of scrapping itself would amount to about \$70,000,000 dollars for us, so that the whole proposal involved throwing overboard \$400,000,000 of American money. It also involved voluntarily giving up a certain first place in seapower (with no close second) and foregoing a positive ability to safeguard American interests the world over.

The proposed capital ship scrapping program for other nations was in no way comparable to our own. Britain had no capital ships under construction and was called upon only to scrap ships already practically obsolete. Japan was to scrap five capital ships under construction, and abandon her paper program for the construction of a number of others. She was to scrap some antiquated battleships, as was also the United States.

We did not ask the other powers to scrap any of their preponderance in auxiliary tonnage, in which we were deficient. But Mr. Hughes did propose that they limit their future construction of such tonnage in return for the immense sacrifices in money and capital ship strength we were voluntarily offering to make in the interest of the principle of general limitation of armaments. Space forbids following the ramifications of the diplomatic battle which followed our extraordinarily generous proposal. But at the end we made our great sacrifice of capital ship strength and money, yet failed to obtain any agreement of future limitation as to light cruisers and other auxiliary tonnage. More than this; we were the only nation which gave up any considerable advantage in the agreements respecting insular bases in the Pacific; thus even further seriously reducing our relative sea power.

If, subsequent to the treaty, the other powers had kept within the spirit of the negotiations by not undertaking the construction of auxiliary tonnage on a large scale, the failure to limit such tonnage by treaty would have been of little importance. But, while we have scrupulously done this up to the present time, it is a fact that other powers have done the reverse. Japan's program of auxiliary tonnage, now in

Continued on page 143

Does Increasing the Navy Incite War?

Pro

Jesse H. Holmes

Member, Friends Peace Committee

ANY study of history shows that increase in armament on the part of a nation is a challenge promptly accepted by rival nations, leads to a period of competition, and ultimately to war. Such result is just what would naturally be expected since development and improvement of army or navy involves a psychology of planning for its use.

Inevitably those who control our foreign policy will be largely influenced in their dealings with other nations by their sense of the amount of force behind them. An excess of power makes for a dictatorial tone, for provocation and in the end, to war. The more navy the more probability of interference, dictation and war.

A navy is primarily a weapon of offense; and indeed even more a weapon of threat and challenge. Navies have been the great centers of competition among imperialistic nations including our own. Yet the experiences of the great war show that they have little defensive value, and are not very important in direct attack. Their main use is in protecting transportation of troops and supplies to foreign battlefields. The defense of sea boundaries is a comparatively simple affair. The coasts of the contending nations of Europe were rendered so dangerous by mines and shore batteries that foreign battleships did not dare to approach them. Not a single successful landing was made on such protected coasts in Germany, Belgium, France, England or Italy, although the contending parties are near neighbors. Yet navies had practically nothing to do with this defense. Of course England, depending on imports for food supply, is in a different position, and her navy did protect transportation, but for continental countries, sufficient unto themselves for food and other essentials a navy is little more than a challenge.

As navies are offensive weapons so the more navy the more offense. What was the purpose of the Washington Conference if the decreasing of navies does not lessen the probability of war? And is not the converse true that increasing navies increases the probability of war? If not then all the talk and planning for general decrease of armament is the merest futility.

If we turn to the particular case of the United States the menace of naval increase is still more in evidence. We have already one of the two most powerful navies in the world. Secretaries Hughes and Hoover assure us that we are in no danger of attack from any source, and common sense supports this assurance. Under such conditions any naval increase is necessarily a threat. Naval expansion, wholly uncalled for by any considerations of national defense, can only be interpreted as involving plans of aggression. It is so interpreted by foreign peoples today, and is a menace to the peace of the world. It is more than ever a menace if it implies a belief that we are a great impartial power whose function it is to set other people in their places.

Our greatest safeguard and our greatest service are alike in justice tempered with intelligent generosity, and sympathetic understanding of other peoples. As a gentleman among nations Uncle Sam will not be found shaking a mailed fist or flourishing a shiny new gun among brother nations.

Con

Mrs. Noble Newport Potts

President, National Patriotic Council

IN THE past wars have been made for comparatively unimportant reasons. But small portions of a nation's population were affected and the cost was so small that the wars could be carried on almost continuously.

Today it is different. War is waged on such a tremendous scale, it affects every person in the country. It is no longer possible for a leader to bring his nation into war unless he has the backing of a great majority of the people. It follows that wars in the future will be waged only where one nation believes it has almost a certainty of winning.

Anything we can do to increase our Navy therefore tends to convince any possible enemy that he has less chance of winning a war with us. If, in addition to a general superiority, we make our increases in such a way that we gain a superiority in all types, another nation will see its last hope of winning disappear. It is conceivable that a nation which is superior to us in battle cruisers, cruising submarines and aircraft carriers might believe it could defeat us by using these types, despite an inferiority in total strength. But if we were able to maintain a superiority in all types, then it is inconceivable that another country could defeat us, and the leader of that country, even though prejudiced, could hardly hope for victory. There would then be practically no chance of that nation declaring war on us. Thus, as far as other nations are concerned, increasing our naval strength would not fail to incite war, but would prevent it.

What chance is there that our leaders and people will be able to discover some profitable war to incite? If we should win such a war, what valuable gain would we receive, commensurate with our sacrifices and efforts. What tangible profits did we demand in the last war, even after we had made our sacrifices? After having waived our rights to the usual spoils of the victor, is there any possibility of our nation waging aggressive wars, costly in blood and treasure, for other spoils?

Thus, an increase in our Navy would deter other nations from attacking us and would offer us no inducement to attack other nations.

Captain E. H. Campbell, U. S. N.

THE dependence upon the effectiveness of the Navy at the outbreak of a war is expressed by the often heard phrase that "the navy is the nation's first line of defense." As long as that line is secure the nation is secure. It is imperative therefore that the nation look well to the effective preparation and upkeep of its first line.

If we have another war it will break suddenly; there will be no friendly allied powers to keep the enemy back while we prepare; we must meet the first shock as we are found on the day war breaks. For that reason it is essential to be prepared to put up a strong defense and not permit ourselves to lapse into a state of mind that leads to a feeling of false security, and that perhaps we can take a chance on the millenium having arrived, economize for a few years as regards military expenditures, and let the navy run down. There can be no more false economy nor more dangerous doctrine than this to a virile nation, one with national policies that conflict with policies of other virile nations.

Does Preparedness Prevent War?

Pro

William H. Standley

Captain, U. S. N.

IT IS foolish to assert that preparedness will prevent war in the sense of eliminating it entirely. Efficient traffic squads will not eliminate traffic law violations, but they will reduce such violations. Efficient fire departments do not prevent fires, but they certainly reduce the loss resulting from fires.

While preparedness will not eliminate war, it will prevent war as far as such action is practicable, and when war becomes inevitable, it offers the best possible insurance against war losses.

Most of our great men have recognized the necessity for preparedness as a national insurance, as the following quotations show:

President Washington: "To be prepared for war is one of the most effective means of preserving peace."

President Adams: "Efficient preparation for war can alone insure peace."

President Arthur: "If we heed the teachings of history, we shall not forget that in the life of every nation emergencies may arise when a resort to arms can alone save it from dishonor."

President Roosevelt: "If we desire to avoid insult we must be able to repel it. If we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."

Even the pacifist, Frederick J. Libby, of the National Council for the Prevention of War, recognizes the necessity for preparedness. In an article in the *Locomotive Engineers Journal* of April, 1923, he stated: "We have discussed adequate preparedness for war. We have discussed adequate preparedness for peace. *None of us believe in unpreparedness.* We must choose between two adequate programs." It would seem then that there is no difference as to the necessity for preparedness as a war deterrent.

Nature recognizes the necessity for protection against attack. "Self-preservation is the first law of nature." The lowly squid is provided with means for defense. The smoke screen of inky fluid which he exudes, permits escape from his enemies.

The tiger has means of defense as well as offense. Man has means of offense as well as defense, and in addition has what the animals and other life have not—the power to reason. The animal uses his power of offense and defense instinctively, unaffected by emotion. Man uses his power of offense and defense in the light of cold reason, influenced at times by emotion.

As it is with man, so it is with nations. Strength always operates to discourage attack; weakness invites aggression. In the earliest time men banded together in tribes to avoid attack from wild animals. A pack of hungry wolves will certainly attack a lone man, but a lone wolf will seldom attack a man, nor will a pack of wolves attack a number of men. Man will fight not only when attacked, but also to defend his interests or his honor, or to resent insult, and in defending such interests he will use every available instrument.

Nations act more deliberately than individuals but eventually are influenced by the same reasoning power and the same impulses. Before taking aggressive action a nation

Continued on page 143

Con

Mrs. Robert M. La Follette

Former Member, Natl. Bd., Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

GREAT aggregations of wealth are not content to control our domestic affairs. They are not content to write our tariff and taxation laws, take over and exploit our natural resources. They dictate our foreign policy also. They are not satisfied with investments in the United States. They make loans all over the world and they make investments in oil and mines and enterprises of various kinds in all parts of the globe. Now if they engaged in these speculations at their own risk it would be their own affair.

But that is not the policy of these financiers. They expect our government to back up their great undertakings. They assume that the flag will follow the investment. They plan to have our army and navy ready to take care of these great foreign ventures. So long as the control of Big Business in government continues, the pressure for the biggest army and biggest navy will go on.

If we continue our present military and naval policy, approved by both Democratic and Republican administrations, we shall be the most militarized nation in the world.

Our army reorganization act was framed by the chiefs of our war college. Its avowed purpose is to make every man of military age a potential soldier. Compulsory universal military training was the keystone of the bill as drawn. It was largely through the efforts of women that Congress rejected the universal compulsory feature. But to military minds it was dropped only "for the time being." All militarists know that compulsory training is necessary to carry out the huge scheme of the 1920 Act. A study of the Mobilization Day plans in connection with that act of 1920 plainly indicates it was intended to give power to the drive for larger military appropriations and compulsory military training.

If it were not for the public sentiment, and I might add if it were not for the sentiment of the women voters of this country, the financiers in combination with the militarists would soon have the United States committed to a military policy no less menacing than that of the Kaiser and to a naval policy even more ambitious than that of Great Britain.

All these plans are the more dangerous because they are being carried on under cover, under the pretence that they are for defense. What folly, what hypocrisy all this talk about hating war, but being prepared for war.

Mr. Lloyd George has fallen from the high place he once held in world politics but he understands the game. No plainer truth was ever uttered than when he said: "It matters not what treaties are signed, what pacts are entered into between nations, what understandings they may establish; it makes no difference what leagues or associations they may found, if nations arm against each other for war—war will ensue in the end."

How can any one in face of the facts argue that preparedness prevents war or insures victory in war. Germany was prepared. Germany was efficiently prepared beyond anything to be expected in the future game of rival armaments. Look at Germany now—disarmed, dismembered, enslaved to the payment of indemnity and reparations covering the greater part of the expense of the world war!

Before the world war the United States had relatively a small army and navy—and yet we had maintained the Monroe Doctrine, built the Panama Canal, and otherwise played our part, without any other nation or combination of nations attacking us.

Does a Weak Navy Invite Aggression?

Pro

W. S. Pye

Captain, U. S. N.

WARLIKE aggression has two principal forms; aggression to control sources of raw materials and aggression to destroy competition in industry with its attendant international commerce.

Civilization demands comforts and conveniences supplied by industry. Nations having intelligence, energy, and ambition become industrialized and endeavor to increase favorable trade balances by supplying other nations' needs. Competition between nations develops just the same as competition between firms conducting similar business in any restricted locality.

In business, when the population is inadequate to support two similar establishments, one admits defeat or goes bankrupt. Laws, made and enforced by the Government, prevent destruction of competition by damage to property and persons. Between nations intense competition results in war.

The United States is the world's richest nation. Our raw material resources and industries are expanded beyond our requirements. European competition soon will become more keen than ever before. Shall we sacrifice our prosperity and revert to Chinese isolation, or shall we insure future prosperity by developing satisfactory foreign markets, which development is dependent upon the maintenance of maritime power.

Maritime power consists of naval strength; a Merchant Marine suitable to commercial and military needs; and suitably located, well equipped naval bases. Naval strength is the most important element, for without it the Merchant Marine and bases can be destroyed.

Naval strength means not only capital ships, but aircraft, submarines, and other types of ships which practical experience demonstrates to be requisite to give a power of offense capable of carrying competition in war to our enemy's coast. The most effective defense, and the one most in keeping with American character, is a strong offense. Most Americans abhor the Chinese Wall system of defense. Our policy in war, as in business, is "Go get them."

The United States, under President Jefferson, attempted to avoid war with Great Britain by permitting the disintegration of the Navy which had been started after the Revolution by President Washington. For the fine frigates which were on the stocks, gunboats carrying one gun apiece were submitted as a naval type. Did this weakening of our Navy invite aggression? The sordid tales of impressed American seamen; insolent attacks on our trade; and the serious effect on our prosperity, constitute a sufficient answer. The War of 1812 was brought on by aggression which was invited by the weakness of our Navy.

The weakness of China on the sea has invited constant aggression from stronger nations. The weakness of the Russian fleet in Siberian waters invited aggression from Japan.

Until human nature shall change more than it has in the last two thousand years, unwillingness to provide for the defense of our interests will signify weakness in national character. The loss of that pioneer spirit, sturdy courage and seeking for the improvement of our race, which has been characteristic of America, will indicate the beginning of decadence, and history in future ages will place the name of America with those of Greece, Carthage, Rome, Spain,

Continued on page 142

Con

Lucia Ames Mead

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

NO NATION attacks a weaker one as a terrier pounces on a rat, for the fun of it. There is always an object in view. The strong always wants to compel the weak to do something or to surrender something whenever it attacks. Denmark and Holland in 1914 were as weak as Belgium, but they were not attacked by Germany, as they did not block the way in her desperate purpose to snipe the guns of Russia's formidable ally and prevent her being pinched between the two halves of a pair of scissors. Weakness as such never invites aggression, as Scandinavian countries and many little countries prove.

The old style of aggression is abhorrent to a world that has gone so far as to get 55 nations to grasp hands and pledge each other not to fight each other or let any one of them fight another until arbitration, judicial decision or investigation by the Council of the League of Nations has been undertaken and until three months after the decision rendered, so that public sentiment can be brought to bear. Nations that have now gone as far as that look back with horror to England's ruthless attack on Denmark and the destruction of her fleet at Copenhagen in 1801. Denmark is now giving up her navy altogether, knowing that the League of Nations is her best protection.

As to ourselves, history shows that we have had a small navy, very much smaller than that of Great Britain, until recently, and yet have not been attacked or in any danger of attack since the Rush-Bagot agreement of 1817 abolished the rival ships on the great lakes, led to the demolition of all the forts along our 3,000 miles of Canadian frontier, and left us able to walk into Canada any time that Great Britain should attack us. We prepared for peace in time of peace and got what we prepared for—the safest border line in the whole world.

The rapid growth of our own navy in the last thirty years, promoted by the outburst of sentiment over the Venezuelan incident, was not due to our weakness but to our growing ambition and belief that this naval increase would give us political prestige. It has incited Japan and other nations to increase their armaments. Whether it has given us any more political prestige than our wealth and trade and natural resources with our moral influence and democratic traditions can supply is very questionable.

There is no reason whatever that we should have as strong a navy as any in the world, either for defense or for prestige any more than there is reason for a healthy, able-bodied man to take much medicine or to invest in crutches. Our coast line is less than half that of Great Britain and the possessions which she must defend. We are 3,000 miles from any possible aggressor, and Great Britain is within gun-shot of the Continent. No nation has ever yet attacked us. We ourselves have declared war always and have had three unnecessary wars. We are peculiarly safe and always have been. Says Secretary Hughes: "So far as we can see into the future, we are safe from the slightest danger of aggression. We recognize our immunity, not that we may boast but rather that we may appraise our duty and responsibility. We know that in no power and no possible combination of powers lies any menace to our security."

Militarists greatly exaggerate our danger from aggression. In all our five foreign wars combined we have had fewer

Continued on page 142

Notes on the Constitution

A Series of Articles Presenting a Practical Analysis of the Provisions of the U. S. Constitution

By Hon. William Tyler Page

Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, Author of "The American Creed"

The First Ten Amendments: "Our Bill of Rights"

Next Month: The Last Nine Amendments

THE tap roots of these amendments are in the English Bill of Rights of 1689, signed by William and Mary. It asserted the right of petition and other privileges. But this Bill of Rights, containing the fundamental principles of political liberty was not extended to the American Colonies. Later, however, a bill or declaration of rights was prefixed to the Constitutions of most of the States which formed the Confederation, which largely followed the phraseology of the English Bill of Rights. The earliest American declaration was the "Body of Liberties" of Massachusetts, in 1641, and the Virginia Constitution of 1776 was accompanied by such an instrument.

The original Constitution of the United States was severely criticized because of the omission of some guarantee of personal rights and might have failed of ratification had not such men as Madison and Hamilton promised to incorporate a set of statements in it by way of amendments. Certain States were only willing to ratify the Constitution upon condition that a bill of rights be attached. It was not a sufficient guarantee to them that the Constitution was erecting a Federal Government with limited powers; they wanted the reservations touching the liberties of the people put down in black and white, and well defined. The result was the adoption of the First Ten Amendments, as *Articles in addition to, and amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America, proposed by Congress, and ratified by the legislatures of the several States pursuant to the fifth article of the original Constitution.*

The first ten amendments were submitted to the several states by a joint resolution of the First Congress, adopted on September 25, 1789, under a preamble reciting:

The conventions of a member of the states having at the time of their adopting the Constitution expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added: And as extending the ground of public confidence in the government will best insure the beneficent ends of its institutions. (1 United States Statutes at Large, p. 97).

Twelve articles were proposed, the first two of which were rejected. Eleven States ratified the Ten Amendments, New Jersey, November 20, 1789, being the first to ratify and Virginia, December 15, 1791, the last. It does not appear that the legislatures of Connecticut, Massachusetts and Georgia ratified them. Vermont ratified shortly after its admission into the Union.

Truly, as John Quincy Adams said, "The Constitution was extorted by grinding necessity from a reluctant people." Although ten in number the amendments embrace no less than 29 specific individual rights which Congress is forbidden to destroy. Enumerated they are:

(1) Religious liberty; (2) freedom of speech; (3) freedom of the press; (4) the right of peaceful assembly; (5) the right of petition for redress of grievances; (6) the right of State militia to bear arms; (7) no soldier shall be quartered in time of peace in a house without consent of the owner; (8) unreasonable search or seizure; (9) no arrest except upon probable cause; (10) supported by oath or affirmation; (11) describing the place (12) and the person or things to be seized; (13) capital offenses must be found by a grand jury indictment; (14) no person shall for the same offense be twice put in jeopardy; (15) compelled to testify against himself; (16) nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; (17) no private property taken for public use without just compensation; (18) in criminal prosecutions the accused shall enjoy a speedy (19) and public trial (20) by an impartial jury (21) in the

district wherein the crime is committed; (22) to be informed of the nature of the accusation; (23) to be confronted by witnesses (24) and the assistance of counsel for his defense; (25) to have compulsory service for obtaining witnesses; (26) the right of trial by jury where the sum exceeds \$20; (27) excessive bail shall not be required (28) nor excessive fines imposed (29) nor cruel and unusual punishment inflicted.

These rights are now all guarded by the Supreme Court.

None of the amendments is a limitation on the States in respect to their own citizens, but were intended to operate upon the national government alone. They left the authority of the States just where they found it and added nothing to the already existing powers of the United States.

Some of the amendments being of 17th and 18th century origin, applicable to customs and laws of those times, and being of foreign genesis, are perhaps now unnecessary or innocuous, public opinion being more efficient; but others have restrained the action of Congress against encroachment upon the reserved powers of the States, and especially have the 5th, 6th and 7th amendments safeguarded the rights of the people not only by restraint upon the National Legislature but by Supreme Court interpretation whenever Congress has attempted to exercise certain powers not delegated to it specifically by the Constitution. As early as 1798 Congress passed two important acts known as the Alien and Sedition Laws. The first authorized the President to order out of this country all such aliens as he might judge to be dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States or engaged in plotting against them. The sedition act provided heavy fines and imprisonment for any person who should conspire to oppose the United States Government or laws, or who should print or publish any false, scandalous, or malicious writings against the Government, Congress, or the President intended to bring disrepute upon them or to stir up sedition. These laws were inspired by denunciations of the neutral attitude of the Government for non-intervention on one side or the other in the French Revolution, and by criticisms of the administration. Many newspapers being in the hands of foreigners at that time accounted for the sedition law. These laws were regarded by the young Republican (Jeffersonian) party of that day as unconstitutional and were denounced by the famous Kentucky and Virginia resolutions as subversive of the liberty of speech and the press. The life of the Alien and Sedition Laws was three years only. Their importance consisted not so much in their essential character and the fact that they largely caused the downfall of the Federalist party, as in their position in American history as a landmark beyond which it is unsafe for the law-making power to go.

In *Robertson v. Baldwin* (1897) 165 U. S. 281, the Supreme Court of the United States said:

The law is perfectly well settled that the first ten amendments to the Constitution, commonly known as the Bill of Rights, were not intended to lay down any novel principles of government, but simply to embody certain guaranties and immunities which we had inherited from our English ancestors, and which had from time immemorial been subject to certain well-recognized exceptions arising from the necessities of the case. In incorporating these principles into the fundamental law there was no intention of disregarding the exceptions, which continued to be recognized as if they had been formally expressed.

Unlike the succeeding nine amendments the first ten amendments to the Constitution left no aftermath of political controversy.

Recent Government Publications of General Interest

The following publications issued by various departments of the Government may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

Agriculture

LETTUCE GROWING IN GREENHOUSES; by James H. Beattie. (Farmers' Bulletin No. 1418.) Price, 5 cents.

Varieties and seed, securing lettuce plants, care of crop, harvesting and packing, storage, and insects injurious to greenhouse lettuce.

THE ROSETTE DISEASE OF WHEAT AND ITS CONTROL; by Aaron G. Johnson and others. (Farmers' Bulletin No. 1414.) Price, 5 cents.

Geographic distribution, crops affected, recurrence, cause, control of wheat rosette, and control in the flag-smut area.

PRODUCTION OF SEED FLAX; by A. C. Dillman. (Farmers' Bulletin No. 1328.) Price, 5 cents.

The flax-growing area, uses, varieties, diseases of flax, etc.

DISEASES OF STONE FRUITS ON THE MARKET; by Dean H. Rose. (Farmers' Bulletin No. 1435.) Price, 5 cents.

Covers alternaria rot of cherries, bacterial spot of peaches, apricots, nectarines, and plums, bruises, gray-mold rot of peaches, hail injury, russet of plums and prunes, scab of peaches, spray injury, etc.

American Historical Association

ANNUAL REPORT OF AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION for year 1919. Price, \$1.25.

Two volumes, Vol. II, The Austin Papers Edited by Eugene C. Barker, Part I.

Birds

FOOD HABITS OF SOME WINTER BIRD VISITANTS; by Ira N. Gabrielson. (Department of Agriculture Bulletin No. 1249.) Price, 10 cents.

Biography

MEMOIRS OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, Vol. XVII. Price, 45 cents.

A biographical memoir of Simon Newcomb, Richard Mayo-Smith, Samuel Hubbard Scudder, George Jarvis Lush, Samuel Wendell Williston, Charles Richard Van Hise, Benjamin Apthorp Gould, and Henry Pickering Bowditch.

Census

FOURTEENTH CENSUS OF U. S., State Compendium, Ky. Price, 30 cents.

Statistics of population, occupation, agriculture, drainage, manufactures, and mines and quarries, for the State, counties, and cities.

Child Dependency

CHILD DEPENDENCY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, an Interpretation of Data Concerning Dependent Children Under the Care of the Public and Private Agencies; by Emma O. Lundberg, and Mary E. Milburn. (Children's Bureau Publication No. 140.) Price, 20 cents.

Commerce

FOREIGN COMMERCE AND NAVIGATION OF U. S. FOR CALENDAR YEAR 1923. Price, \$1.75.

Statistical tables of foreign commerce of U. S., etc.

COMMERCE YEARBOOK, 1923. Price, 85 cents.

Production, employment and domestic trade, wholesale and retail prices, fuel and power, metals, construction materials, textiles and clothing, international trade in 1923, and foreign countries—economic reviews and statistical data, with index.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF AGRICULTURE PRODUCTS; by G. B. L. Amer, and others. (Separate from Yearbook 1923, No. 905.) Price, 5 cents.

Selected forest products, and imports of fruit stocks, rose stocks, bulbs, and tree seeds, etc.

Construction Tests

TANGENT MODULUS AND THE STRENGTH OF STEEL COLUMNS IN TESTS; by O. H. Basquin. (Bureau of Standards Technologic Paper No. 263.) Price, 20 cents.

Covers tangent modulus and Engesser's theory of column strength, related problems and suggestions.

Containers

STANDARD BASKETS FOR FRUITS AND VEGETABLES; by F. P. Downing and H. A. Spilman. (Farmers' Bulletin No. 1434.) Price, 5 cents.

Causes of variation in containers, importance of standard containers, existing Federal standards, sales by measure versus sales by weight, need of further Federal standards, list of States having standardized containers.

Cost of Living

COST OF LIVING IN THE UNITED STATES. (Labor Bureau Bulletin No. 357.) Price, 45 cents.

Covers the cost of living in the United States with summary and general tables.

Education

STATISTICS OF UNIVERSITIES, COLLEGES AND PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS, 1921-22, Prepared by Statistical Division of Bureau of Education under direction of Frank M. Phillips. (Bureau of Education Bulletin 1924, No. 20.) Price, 20 cents.

Professors and instructors, students, degree, property, receipts, comparative statistics, with statistical tables.

Farm Plumbing

FARM PLUMBING; by George M. Warren. (Farmers' Bulletin No. 1426.) Price, 5 cents.

Plumbing terms, pipe, fittings, joints and connections, fixtures, hot water, protection of pipes, roof connections, and care of plumbing, etc.

Food Research

TABLES FOR CONVERTING CRUDE PROTEIN AND ASH CONTENT TO A UNIFORM MOISTURE BASE; by J. H. Shollenberger and D. A. Coleman. (Agriculture Misc. Circular No. 28.) Price, 5 cents.

Covers table 1, crude protein equivalents for 13.5 per cent moisture content, table 2, ash equivalent for 13.5 per cent moisture content, table 3, crude protein in wheat and flour computed from the percentages of total nitrogen found.

Forest Products

FORESTRY AND FOREST PRODUCTS; by Harold S. Betts and others. (Separate from Yearbook 1923, No. 904.) Price, 5 cents.

Wood and timber stands, forest planting, forest fires, grazing in national forests, lumber production and value, annual timber removal, turpentine and rosin, etc.

THE FRENCH TURPENTINING SYSTEM APPLIED TO LONGLEAF PINE; by E. R. McKee. (Department Circular No. 327.) Price, 5 cents.

Experiment, analysis of results, and common labor and the French system, with conclusions.

Labor

WAGES AND HOURS OF LABOR IN FOUNDRIES AND MACHINE SHOPS, 1923. (Labor Bureau Bulletin No. 362.) Price, 15 cents.

Live Stock

FARM ANIMALS AND THEIR PRODUCTS; Part II—General, Horses, Sheep and Poultry; by Joseph A. Becker, and others. (Separate from Yearbook, 1923, No. 903.) Price, 10 cents.

Covers sheep, sheep and lambs, inspected slaughter, wool, meats, hides and skins, horses and mules, livestock, by countries, poultry, eggs, and milk.

Oxidation

OXIDATION OF ZINC VAPOR BY CARBON DIOXIDE; by B. M. O'Hara. (Mines Bureau Technical Paper No. 336.) Price, 5 cents.

Public Utilities

TECHNICAL CONFERENCE OF STATE UTILITY COMMISSION ENGINEERS, March 2 and 3, 1923. (Bureau of Standards Miscellaneous Publication No. 58.) Price, 15 cents.

Public utility work of the Bureau of Standards, discussion of papers on grading of utilities, etc.

Reflectivity Measurements

ULTRA-VIOLET REFLECTING POWER OF SOME METALS AND SULPHIDES; by W. W. Coblenz, and C. W. Hughes. (Standards Bureau Scientific Paper No. 493.) Price, 5 cents.

River Pollution

A STUDY OF POLLUTION AND NATURAL PURIFICATION OF OHIO RIVER; II, Report on Surveys and Laboratory Studies. Price, 60 cents.

Sources of pollution, plan and methods of laboratory studies, chemical studies, bacteriological studies.

Soap

PERFORMANCE TESTS OF A LIQUID LAUNDRY SOAP USED WITH TEXTILE MATERIALS; by F. R. McGowen and others. (Bureau of Standards Technologic Paper No. 273.) Price, 10 cents.

Soil Survey

SOIL SURVEY OF THE BENSON AREA, ARIZ.; by E. J. Carpenter and W. S. Brandsford. Price, 15 cents.

Area, climate, agriculture, and soils, with summary and map.

—O'BRIEN CO., IA.; by J. Ambrose Elwell, and others. Price, 15 cents.

—SHEVLEN CO., GA.; by David D. Long, and others. Price, 20 cents.

—CALDWELL CO., MO.; by William DeYoung and Howard V. Jordan. Price, 15 cents.

The Supreme Court of the United States

The Supreme Court of the United States convened October 6, 1924, for the annual term of the Court, which will continue until June, 1925. The 36 weeks of the annual term are divided into 19 weeks of argument, and 17 weeks of recess for the purpose of writing opinions. Since the Court convened the following recesses have been taken: Oct. 27-Nov. 17, 1924; Dec. 15, 1924-Jan. 5, 1925.

Recent Decisions of National Interest

The Chicago Drainage Case

The case—No. 161. The Sanitary District of Chicago, Appellant, v. United States. Appeal from U. S. Distr. Court for No. Distr. of Ill.

The decision—The decree for an injunction to go into effect in sixty days, is affirmed.

The opinion was delivered by Mr. Justice Holmes, January 5, 1925.

This is a bill in equity brought by the United States to enjoin the Sanitary District of Chicago, a corporation of Illinois, from diverting water from Lake Michigan in excess of 250,000 cubic feet per minute; the withdrawal of that amount having been authorized by the Secretary of War. It is alleged that the withdrawal of more, viz., from 400,000 to 600,000 cubic feet per minute, has lowered and will lower the level of the water of Lake Michigan, Lake Huron, Lake St. Clair, Lake Erie, Lake Ontario, Sault Ste Marie, St. Mary's River, St. Clair River, Detroit River, Niagara River, St. Lawrence River, and all the harbors, &c., connected there with, all of which are alleged to be navigable waters of the United States, and will thus create an obstruction to the navigable capacity of said waters; and that it will alter and modify the condition and capacity of the above named and their ports, &c., connected with them.

The withdrawal practiced and threatened is through an artificial channel that takes the place of the Chicago River, formerly a little stream flowing into Lake Michigan, and of a part of its branches. The channel instead of adding water to the Lake has been given an opposite incline, takes its water from the Lake, flows into the Desplaines River, which empties into the Illinois River, which in its turn empties into the Mississippi. The channel is at least twenty-five feet deep and at least one hundred and sixty-two feet wide; and while its interest to the defendant is primarily as a means to dispose of the sewage of Chicago, *Missouri v. Illinois*, 200 U. S. 496, it has been an object of attention to the United States as opening water communication between the Great Lakes and the Mississippi and the Gulf.

This is not a controversy between equals. The United States is asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. It has a standing in this suit not only to remove obstruction to interstate and foreign commerce, the main ground, but also to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power bordering upon some of the Lakes concerned, and, it may be, also on the footing of an ultimate sovereign interest in the Lakes.

Evidence is sufficient to show that a withdrawal of water on the scale directed by the statute of Illinois threatens and will affect the level of the Lakes, and that is a matter which cannot be done without the consent of the United States, even were there no international covenant in the case.

After the refusal, in January, 1913, to allow an increase of flow, the appellant was notified by direction of the War Department that it was drawing more water than was allowed and was violating Section 10 of the Act of March 3, 1899. In reply it intimated that it was bound by the state law and in obedience to it had been flowing 20,000 cubic feet per minute for each 100,000 of population and could not reduce that flow. It suggested that its rights should be determined by a suit, and accordingly this bill was filed on October 6, 1913. An earlier suit had been brought on March 23, 1908, to prevent the construction of a second channel from Lake Michigan through the Calumet River to the appellant's main channel, leave to do which had been refused by Mr. Secretary Taft. (The permit subsequently granted on June 30, 1910, was with the understanding that it should not affect or be used in the 'friendly suit' then pending to determine rights.) The earlier suit was consolidated with the later present one, and it was agreed that the evidence taken in that should be used in this, so far as applicable. There was some delay in concluding the case, which the defendant naturally would desire, but after it was submitted to the Judge according to his own statement he kept it about six years before delivering an oral opinion in favor of the Government on June 19, 1920. No valid excuse was offered for the delay. There was a motion for reconsideration, but the Judge took no further action of any kind until he resigned in 1922. On June 18, 1923, another Judge entered a decree for an injunction as prayed, with a stay of six months to enable the defendant to present the record to this Court.

The parties have come to this Court for the law, and we have no doubt that as the law stands the injunction prayed for must be granted. As we have indicated a large part of the evidence is irrelevant and immaterial to the issues that we have to decide. Probably the dangers to which the City of Chicago will be subjected if the decree is carried out are exaggerated, but in any event we are not at liberty to consider them here as against the edict of a paramount power. The decree for an injunction as prayed is affirmed, to go into effect in sixty days—without prejudice to any permit that may be issued by the Secretary of War according to law.—
Extracts.

Pro—continued

Hon. Thomas S. Butler—*Cont'd from page 128*

by the existing treaty. When the nations met here in Washington it was the purpose to agree upon the strength of different fighting units to be retained and I do not believe that that strength so determined ought to be altered or amended except by further conference of the same nations.

Con—continued

Frederick J. Libby—*Cont'd from page 132*

the spiritual realm where competition does not lead to war. When America devotes its strength to maintaining a 5-5-3 ratio with England and Japan in the building of international cooperation and goodwill, the peace and security of all nations, and especially our own, can become a reality.

Calendar of Legislative Action—continued from page 115

To enlarge powers of Washington Hospital for Foundlings, etc. Reptd. Dec. 18; H. R. 10624; Graham, Pa., R.
To amend tariff act of 1922, and to change title of Bd. of U. S. Gen. Appraisers to U. S. Customs Court, etc. Reptd. Jan. 15; H. R. 11638; Weller, N. Y., D.

Library Committee

To establish Comm. for observance of anniversary of Battle of Lexington and Concord. Reptd. by Apprs. Com. and passed S. Jan. 5; H. J. Res. 259; Luce, Mass., R.
To procure design for use of U. S. Botanic Garden. Reptd. by S. Com. on Library Dec. 16; Passed Senate Dec. 30; H. J. Res. 257; Luce, Mass., R.; approved Jan. 7; Pub. Res. No. 42.

Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee

To extend time limitation on use of Govt.-owned radio stations for certain purposes. Reptd. Jan. 12; H. J. Res. 317; Free, Calif., R.

Military Affairs Committee

To accept Ford offer for Muscle Shoals. Passed S. with Underwood substitute amdt. Jan. 14; H. R. 518; McKenzie, Ill., R.
To purchase land adjoining Fort Bliss, Tex. Reptd. Jan. 15; H. R. 8267; Hudspeth, Tex., D.
For addtl. facilities at Walter Reed Hospital. Reptd. Jan. 12; H. R. 11252; McKenzie, Ill., R.
To extend time for exchange of Govt. lands for private lands in Hawaii. Reptd. Jan. 12, H. R. 11410; McKenzie, Ill., R.

Naval Affairs Committee

To authorize pay to certain supply officers of reg. Navy and Naval Reserve Forces, for services performed prior to approval of their bonds. Passed Jan. 5; Reptd. to S. Nav. Affrs. Com. Jan. 6; H. R. 8263; Burt-ness, N. D., R.
To authorize alterations to certain naval vessels, etc. Approved Dec. 18; H. R. 8687; Butler, Pa., R. Public Law No. 297.
To provide for creation and maintenance, etc., of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve. Reptd. by S. Naval Affrs. Com. Jan. 19; H. R. 9634; Britten, Ill., R.
To extend nurses' quarters at naval hospital, Washington, D. C., etc. Reptd. Dec. 17; H. R. 10685; Butler, Pa., R.
To construct public works at naval air station, Pensacola, Fla. Reptd. Dec. 17; H. R. 10739; Britten, Ill., R.
To authorize increase in limits of cost of *Lexington* and *Saratoga* as airplane carriers. Reptd. Jan. 6; H. R. 11282; Butler, Pa., R.

Patents Committee

For Comm. to select certain Patent Office models for retention and to dispose of said models. Reptd. Jan. 7; H. R. 8550; Lampert, Wis., R.

Post Office and Post Roads Committee

To provide for quarterly money-order accts. at 3rd and 4th class P. O. Reptd. by S. P. O. and P. Rds. Com. Jan. 15; H. R. 4441; Sproul, Ill., R.
To grant sick leave to employees of mail-equipment shops. Passed Dec. 31; H. R. 6353; Griest, Pa., R.
To authorize emergency mail service in Alaska. Passed Dec. 31; H. R. 6581; Sutherland, Del., Alaska, R.
To maintain air mail service, etc. Passed Dec. 17; Reftd. to S. P. O. and P. Rds. Com. Dec. 18; H. R. 6942; LaGuardia, N. Y., R.
To encourage commercial aviation and to contract for air mail service.

Congress Day by Day—continued from page 116

Friday, January 9, 1925—continued

HOUSE—continued

Began consideration of the bill (H. R. 8887, McFadden, Pa., R.) providing for the consolidation of national banking associations. Mr. Nelson, Wis., R., spoke against the bill. Mr. McFadden, Pa., R., explained the provisions of the bill.
Adjourned.

Saturday, January 10, 1925

SENATE:

Resumed consideration of the Muscle Shoals bill (H. R. 518). Mr. Wadsworth, N. Y., R., Mr. McNary, Ore., R., Mr. Smith, S. C., D., Mr. Simmons, N. C., D., Mr. Jones, N. M., D., Mr. Heflin, Ala., D., spoke on the measure.

The Wadsworth amendment providing for a commission of five to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, to investigate and report on the Muscle Shoals problem was defeated by a vote of 65 to 5.

Mr. Oddie, Nev., R., spoke in behalf of the Spanish Springs Irrigation Project, Nevada, which is to be considered by the conferees on the Department of Interior appropriation bill (H. R. 10020).

Passed Dec. 18; Reftd. to S. P. O. and P. Rds. Com. Dec. 18; Reftd. Jan. 14; H. R. 7064; Kelly, Pa., R.

To declare pistols and other firearms non-mailable, and providing penalty. Passed Dec. 17; Reftd. to S. P. O. and P. Rds. Com. Dec. 18; Reftd. Jan. 14; H. R. 9093; Miller, Wash., R.

Public Lands Committee

To include certain lands in Plumas National Forest. Reptd. by S. Pub. Lds. and Svys. Com. Jan. 8; H. R. 103; Raker, Cal., D.
To consolidate certain lands within Snoqualmie Natl. Forest. Reptd. Jan. 13; H. R. 2689; Hadley, Wash., R.
For relief of certain entrymen in Mont. Passed S. Dec. 30; H. R. 3511; Leavitt, Mont., R.
To add certain lands to Whitman Natl. Forest. Reptd. Jan. 13; H. R. 5612; Sinnott, Ore., R.
To add certain lands to the Umatilla, Wallowa, and Whitman National Forests in Ore. Amended and passed Jan. 5; Reftd. to S. Pub. Lds. and Svys. Com. Jan. 6; H. R. 6651; Sinnott, Ore., R.
To authorize Secy. of Interior to lease certain lands. Reptd. Dec. 20; H. R. 6710; Sinnott, Ore., R.
To define trespass on U. S. coal land, etc. Reptd. Dec. 20; H. R. 6713; Sinnott, Ore., R.
To add certain lands to Oregon Natl. Forest. Reptd. Jan. 13; H. R. 9028; Sinnott, Ore., R.
To promote mining of potash on public domain. Reptd. Jan. 8; H. R. 9029; Sinnott, Ore., R.
To grant preference rights to certain claimants to purchase unappropriated public lands. Reptd. Jan. 13; H. R. 9765; Sandlin, La., D.
To exempt from cancellation certain desert land entries in Riverside Co., Calif. Reptd. Jan. 13; H. R. 10143; Swing, Calif., R.
To grant desert land entrymen extension of time for making final proof. Reptd. Jan. 13; H. R. 10411; Sinnott, Ore., R.
To extend time for pymts. on Homestead entries on Cheyenne River and Standing Rock Indian Resvns. Reptd. Jan. 9; H. R. 10592; Williamson, S. D., R.
To include certain lands in Plumas-Eldorado, Stanislaus, Shasta and Tahoe National Forests. Reptd. Jan. 3; H. R. 11211; Raker, Calif., D.
To repeal act of Jan. 27, 1922, providing for change of entry, etc. Reptd. Jan. 9; H. R. 11356; Sinnott, Ore., R.
To permit restoration to public domain of certain public lands reserved as natl. monuments. Reptd. Jan. 9; H. R. 11357; Sinnott, Ore., R.
To amend act to consolidate natl. forest lands. Reptd. Jan. 13; H. R. 11500; Sinnott, Ore., R.

Rivers and Harbors Committee

To authorize construction, etc., of certain public works on rivers and harbors. Reptd. Jan. 9; Passed Jan. 15; H. R. 11472; Dempsey, N. Y., R.

Ways and Means Committee

For relief of certain customs employees at Port of Philadelphia. Passed Jan. 5; Reftd. to S. Fin. Com. Jan. 6; H. R. 2858; Darrow, Pa., R.
To refund taxes paid on distilled spirits in certain cases. Reptd. Jan. 10; H. R. 10528; Johnson, Ky., D.
To authorize settlement of indebtedness of Lithuania to U. S. Passed Dec. 16; passed S. Dec. 17; H. R. 10650; Burton, O., R. Approved Dec. 22; Public Law No. 298.
To authorize settlement of indebtedness of Poland to U. S. Passed Dec. 16; passed S. Dec. 17; H. R. 10651; Burton, O., R. Approved Dec. 22; Public Law No. 299.

Ratified the Arbitration Convention with Sweden, signed June 24, 1924.

The nomination of James Rockwell Sheffield to be ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Mexico was confirmed.
Recessed.

HOUSE:

Resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 8887, McFadden, Pa., R.) to provide for the consolidation of national banking associations. Mr. Stevenson, S. C., D., Mr. Wingo, Ark., D., Mr. Williams, Mich., R., Mr. Black, Tex., D., Mr. Morton D. Hull III, R., Mr. LaGuardia, N. Y., R., and Mr. Bacon, N. Y., R., and Mr. McFadden, Pa., R., discussed the bill.

The Committee on Appropriations reported the bill (H. R. 11505) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, etc., for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, carrying a total of \$452,349,617.

Mr. Blanton, Tex., D., stated his objections to the bill (S. 703) making an adjustment of certain accounts between the United States and the District of Columbia.

Adjourned.

Monday, January 12, 1925

SENATE:

Agreed to conference report on the bill (H. R. 62, Hickey, Ind., R.) establishing an additional Federal judgeship for Indiana.

Resumed consideration of the Muscle Shoals bill (H. R. 518). Mr. McKellar, Tenn., D., opposed the Underwood substitute amendment.

Mr. Copeland, N. Y., D., spoke on the Allied policy toward the German commercial aircraft industry.

Mr. Dill, Wash., D., spoke on the French debt to the United States. Mr. Borah, Ida., R., spoke on the present agricultural situation and declared that the need for legislative relief was as great as before the election.

Recessed.

HOUSE:

Considered bills relative to the District of Columbia. Passed the bill (S. 387) providing for electrocution instead of hanging as the method of capital punishment in the District.

Considered in Committee of the Whole the bill (S. 703, Phipps, Colo., R.) making an adjustment of certain accounts between the United States and the District of Columbia, and which involves the transfer to the District of the surplus of \$4,438,154 in the United States Treasury.

A motion by Mr. Blanton, Tex., D., to strike out the enacting clause was defeated by a vote of 47 to 32.

Adjourned.

Tuesday, January 13, 1925

SENATE:

Resumed consideration of the Muscle Shoals bill (H. R. 518). Mr. Jones, Wash., R., spoke on his substitute amendment providing for a commission composed of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Agriculture and one other to be appointed by the President to consider every proposal connected with the development of Muscle Shoals and to report on or before the first Monday in December, 1925. The amendment was agreed to by a vote of 46 to 33.

Mr. Norris, Nebr., R., then offered an amendment striking out the Jones amendment and inserting a substitute providing for government operation of Muscle Shoals. The Norris substitute amendment was agreed to by a vote of 40 to 39.

Mr. Underwood, Ala., D., then moved to strike out the Norris amendment and substitute his original amendment with a modification of section 4.

Mr. Norris, Nebr., R., appealed from the decision of the Chair that the Underwood amendment was in order. The decision of the Chair was sustained by a vote of 52 to 22.

Agreed to a unanimous consent proposal to lay aside the unfinished business and consider the urgent deficiency bill (H. R. 11308) for the year ending June 30, 1925. The bill carrying a total of \$159,449,838 was passed. An amendment to the bill substituted by Mr. King, Utah, D., under which the Treasury would be required to report the names and amounts paid in all cases where refund of income taxes are made, was agreed to.

Recessed.

*Pro—continued*Luke McNamee—*Cont'd from page 130*

land, with complete naval disarmament, or one of a dozen minor powers, filled with altruism but lacking naval strength, did not call this conference? Did the fact that we were powerful on the sea, and were building the greatest Navy in the world, have something to do with it? Possibly. Would those great powers have ignored a call for such a conference by China, a country that is helpless to resist aggression? Possibly. On the whole, have we not learned in five thousand years of history that when statesmen sit down around the council board, the one with the greatest background of armed strength receives the most respectful hearing? I think so.

If we are to retain our prestige; if we are to keep our place as one of the great custodians of civilization; if we are to preserve the heritage of our freedom and our institutions and transmit that heritage unsullied to our descendants; if we are to guard our families and our firesides; let us keep in our hands the power that God has given us, and renounce once and forever the sophistries of the Delilahs of pacifism, that would shear the Navy of its strength.—*Extracts, see 5, p. 143.*

HOUSE:

Resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 8887, McFadden, Pa., R.) providing for the consolidation of national banking associations, etc. Adjourned.

Wednesday, January 14, 1925

SENATE:

Resumed consideration of the Muscle Shoals bill (H. R. 518). The amendment offered by Mr. Underwood in the nature of a substitute to the bill was agreed to by a vote of 46 to 33. Mr. Jones, Wash., R., again offered his substitute amendment for the Underwood amendment. The Jones amendment providing for a Commission to investigate and report on Muscle Shoals, was rejected by a vote of 43 to 38. The substitute amendment offered by Mr. McKellar, Tenn., D., was rejected by a vote of 52 to 29.

The bill (H. R. 518) carrying the Underwood substitute amendment as amended was then passed by a vote of 50 to 30. On motion of Mr. Underwood the title of the bill (H. R. 518) was amended to read "A bill to provide for the national defense, for the production and manufacture of fixed nitrogen, commercial fertilizer, and other useful products, etc."

Pursuant to a unanimous consent agreement proceeded in open executive session to consider the treaty between the United States and Cuba signed March 2, 1904, for the adjustment of title to the ownership of the Isle of Pines.

The Isle of Pines Treaty was temporarily laid aside and the Senate began consideration of the bill (H. R. 10724) making appropriations for the Navy Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926.

Agreed to a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) providing for a joint session, Wednesday, February 11, to count the electoral votes for President and Vice-President of the United States.

Adjourned.

HOUSE:

By a vote of 172 to 65 passed the bill (H. R. 8887, McFadden, Pa., R.) for consolidation of national banking associations, etc. Previous to the passage of the bill a motion to recommit by Mr. Black, Tex., D., was rejected by a vote of 236 to 90.

Thursday, January 15, 1925

SENATE:

Mr. Amherst, Ariz., D., criticized at length the elimination in conference of the \$200,000 appropriation for the completion of the Yuma irrigation project carried in the urgent deficiency bill (H. R. 11308), and held up the adoption of the conference report on the bill.

Resumed consideration in open executive session of the Isle of Pines Treaty. Mr. Swanson, Va., D., spoke in support of the Treaty. Mr. Ralston, Ind., D., spoke against ratification.

Recessed.

HOUSE:

Passed by a vote of 179 to 6 the bill (H. R. 11472) authorizing the construction, repair and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors. The bill carried a total of \$39,151,000.

Adjournment.

*Con—continued*Hon. Edward W. Pou—*Cont'd from page 130*

that is financially solvent there is every reason why we should go forth following the great moral light of peace rather than continue preparation for war. It is just as dangerous for nations as it is for men to go forth armed to the teeth. Just as surely as this race for naval supremacy continues, just so surely will the world be again drenched in blood.—*Extracts, see 4, p. 143.*

Hon. Philip D. Swing—*Cont'd from page 129*

number of battleships we have ought to have more scout cruisers than we possess. The cruisers are the eyes of the Navy. It is their duty to get information of the enemy fleet, and prevent the enemy from getting information of our fleet. We have today an insufficient number of ships of this class to adequately perform this duty. The destroyers, of which we have a surplus, cannot be made to perform the functions of cruisers. We have, therefore, authorized an increased number based solely upon our own needs, and with no purpose in mind of undertaking to outstrip some other nation in this line.

A Glossary of Naval Terms—continued from page 123

States is to scrap 11 capital ships under construction by February 17, 1925. These were the battle cruisers, *United States*, *Constellation*, *Constitution* and *Ranger*; the battleships *Massachusetts*, *South Dakota*, *Indiana*, *Montana*, *North Carolina*, *Iowa* and *Washington*. The older capital ships required to be scrapped were the battleships *Virginia*, *New Jersey*, *Rhode Island*, *Georgia*, *Nebraska*, *Connecticut*, *Louisiana*,^{*} *Vermont*, *Minnesota*, *Kansas*, *New Hampshire*, *South Carolina*, *Michigan*, *Delaware* or *North Dakota*.

The *Washington* was sunk, after a series of aerial and underwater bomb tests and gunfire, off the Virginia capes on November 25, 1924. The *North Dakota* is retained under treaty term for target purposes exclusively. The *New Jersey* and *Virginia* were sunk by the Army in experimental bombing exercises. The other older capital ships have been disposed of by sale, to be cut up as scrap metal; where bids were unsatisfactory, the navy yards disposed of these vessels. The remaining vessels have been scrapped or will be scrapped by February 17, 1925.

National Defense Act: Approved June 3, 1916, and was the basis of the reorganization of the United States Army.

Navy Day, October 27th: The observance of Navy Day originated in 1922 and is sponsored by the Navy League of the United States, a patriotic civilian organization which decided that a day should be set apart for the commemoration of the deeds of American sailors in the World War and in our country's other struggles, and also for bringing before the attention of the public the value of the Navy to the nation in peace and in war. Endorsed by the President, Secretary of the Navy, and by large numbers of social, business and patriotic bodies, the celebration has become a recognized event in the calendar year.

Insignia: Officers' insignia is worn on the sleeve (cuffs) of blue service uniform, on the cap visor (for Commanders and above), on the shoulder marks of white service uniform and overcoats, and on the epaulets (worn on shoulders) of dress uniforms.

Admiral—(Caps): Visor embroidered full in gold with oak leaves and acorns on blue field. (Sleeves): One 2-inch stripe, three $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch stripes above. (Shoulders): Silver foul anchor, 4 silver stars, all on gold field.

Vice-Admiral—(Caps): Same as Admiral. (Sleeves): One

2-inch stripe, two $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch stripes above. (Shoulders): Silver foul anchor, 3 silver stars, all on gold field.

Rear-Admiral—(Caps): Same as Admiral. (Sleeves): One 2-inch stripe, two $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch stripes above. (Shoulders): Silver foul anchor, 2 silver stars, all on gold field.

Captain—(Caps): Visor embroidered on front edge with gold with oak leaves and acorns on blue field. (Sleeves): Four $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch stripes. (Shoulders): Stripes same as sleeves.

Commander—(Caps): Same as Captain. (Sleeves): Three $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch stripes. (Shoulders): Stripes same as sleeves.

Lieutenant-Commander—(Caps): Plain. (Sleeves): Two $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch stripes, one $\frac{1}{4}$ -inch stripe between. (Shoulders): Stripes same as sleeves.

Lieutenant—(Caps): Plain. (Sleeves): Two $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch stripes. (Shoulders): Same as Lieut. Commander.

Lieutenant (Junior grade)—(Caps): Plain. (Sleeves): One $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch stripe, one $\frac{1}{4}$ -inch stripe above it. (Shoulders): Same as Lieut. Commander.

Ensign—(Caps): Plain. (Sleeves): One $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch stripe. (Shoulders): Same as Lieut. Commander.

Devices to differentiate officer branches* are worn above the stripes and are as follows:

Line Officer—Gold star.

Medical Officer—Gold spread oak leaf, surcharged with a silver acorn.

Dental Officer—Gold sprig of oak leaf, with silver acorns on either side of stem.

Supply Officer—Gold sprig of three oak leaves and three acorns.

Naval Constructor—Gold sprig of two live-oak leaves spreading with acorn between leaves.

Civil Engineer—Two gold sprigs, crossed, of live-oak leaves with silver acorn on each sprig.

Chaplain—Gold Latin cross.

Professor of Mathematics—Gold oak leaf with slightly curving stem and acorn attached to concave side of stem.

Aviation Insignia—Gold pin on left breast, winged, foul anchor surcharged on shield, worn by qualified pilots.

Naval Reserve—Same as regular insignia.

*Lack of space prevents description of the insignia of midshipmen, chief warrant officers, warrant officers, chief petty officers, or men of the enlisted branches.

Pro—continued

W. S. Pye—Cont'd from page 136

and others which failed to realize that maritime power is a symbol of national greatness and an insurance of national prosperity. "The sceptre of power is the trident of the sea."

The poor widow is most often the victim of swindlers. Why? Because of weakness. Do our banks leave their vaults open at night? Would such an action invite aggression? How many bankers would take the chance? A weak Navy leaves open the vaults which contain our homes, our families, and the blessings of liberty. How many desire to take the chance and leave these vaults open? Does a weak Navy invite aggression? History and common sense, answer—yes.

Hon. Henry B. Steagall—Cont'd from page 131

that have guided us in the past and resist the temptations to militarism, which is fast destroying the nations of the Old World, our future will be safe.—*Extracts, see 4, p. 143.*

Con—continued

Hon. John Jacob Rogers—Cont'd from page 127

cruiser-submarine and no mine-laying submarines. As shown by the Germans, these are important types in fleet actions.

On the whole, it must be concluded that America as a naval power is rapidly falling behind the conference ratio and that unless Congress takes prompt and vigorous action the disparity will seriously imperil our security. Even as things now stand, the relative inferiority of the United States means that in the event of a supplementary naval limitation conference we should not be in nearly as strong a position as in 1921 to secure anything like the appropriate reductions from the principal powers of the world.

Lucia Ames Mead—Cont'd from page 136

men killed by foreigners than we have had murdered in this country in ten years! I am not pleading that we should abolish our navy until other nations abolish theirs. I do plead that taxpayers should be compelled to support only such a navy as is commensurate with our real needs.

Peace Time Activities—continued from page 122

in the fleet flagship. Following the arrival of the first vessels of the fleet came shiploads of materials to the amount of three-quarters of a million of dollars purchased by the Navy through their purchasing agents in China and Manila and from the Naval Store Ships of the Asiatic Fleet.

One of the greatest peace-time duties of our Navy is to promote good will toward America in all parts of the world. This is not only for the assistance of our State Department in carrying on its policies with foreign countries but it is to promote trade with American concerns.

A mission of naval officers has been in Brazil for about a year reorganizing the Brazilian Navy. The effect of the presence of this mission has been to direct the attention of the growing country of Brazil to the U. S. for the purchase of manufactured materials that are essential to progress.

Numerous appeals for aid come to the Commanders of our gunboats in China Rivers from American business men in China. Piracy has been rampant in China and shooting at American steamers a common occurrence, until recent drastic action by the American Navy has had its effect. Recently through the tact of one of the Commanders of a U. S. Navy Gunboat on the Yangtze River, representatives of the generals of two opposing Chinese armies were brought together in a truce which prevented the bombardment of a large and populous Chinese city.

The Navy in Haiti and Santo Domingo are now turning those countries over to native control, having been in these countries long enough to settle their political revolutions, to honestly collect their customs revenues through naval paymasters, to meet their foreign obligations, and to turn over their treasures in a sound financial condition.

Some of the recent advances made in science by the Navy have been the perfection of the Radio Compass, by which shore stations give positions of ships at sea when approaching the Coasts, when lighthouses fail on account of fog.

Another scientific advance is that of charting the ocean and coast depths by means of sound devices. The Navy has fostered and encouraged the development of helium, which renders travel by dirigible safe. Through use of this safe gas commercial use of zeppelins may be possible. The Navy's new ZR-1 (*Schenck*) is an excellent forerunner of the possibilities that may develop into a successful commercial means of rapid transportation.

Ralph F. Jozier—continued from page 129

The evidence is far from convincing that our Navy has deteriorated to such an extent as to imperil our national defense. This legislation commits the United States to a naval building program which will stimulate competitive building of similar vessels by other nations and we will then be involved in a mad race in competitive shipbuilding. Battleships are built not for peace but for war.—*Est.*, see 4.

William H. Standley—continued from page 135

takes into account her own strength and weakness, and the strength and weakness of her possible opponent, and if the cost is too great, will hesitate to make war, or to take action which will bring about her destruction. The first law of nature will prevent. Preparedness which is strength or power to resist attack, will certainly operate to prevent wars.

Sources From Which Material in This Number is Taken

- Articles for which no source is given have been specially prepared for this number of THE CONGRESSIONAL DIGEST
- 1—Speech before Natl. Academy of Political and Social Science, Jan. 20, 1923.
 - 2—Speech from Radio Broadcasting Station WJZ, April 22, 1924.
 - 3—Extracts from "The Washington Conference" by Raymond Leslie Buell. (New York: Appleton & Co., 1922.)
 - 4—Extracts from "The Congressional Record," May 28, 1924.
 - 5—Extracts from speech before the Women's Republican Club of Mass., Jan. 22, 1923.
 - 6—Extracts from President Coolidge's Annual Message to Congress, Dec. 3, 1924.
 - 7—Extracts from statement by Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Wilbur, before Sub-Comm. on Naval Affairs of the House Appropriations Com. on Dec. 8, 1924.

Relative Naval Strength—continued from page 125

POWER	Personnel (Unlimited)		Regular Establishment on basis of S-S-3	
	Regular Establishment (including those of dominions)		Officers	Men
United States.....	8,148	86,000	12,030	109,005
British Empire.....	8,669	93,297	12,030	109,005
Japanese Empire.....	7,218	65,404	7,218	65,404

*Authorized and appropriated for and building.

United States (18 Capital Ships: total tonnage 525,850)

Name	Completed	Ton- Speed	Name	Completed	Ton- Speed
		nage Knots			nage Knots
West Virginia.....	1923	32,600 21	Pennsylvania.....	1916	31,440 21
Colorado.....	1923	32,600 21	Oklahoma.....	1916	27,500 20
Maryland.....	1921	32,600 21	Nevada.....	1916	27,500 20
California.....	1921	32,500 21	New York.....	1914	27,000 21
Tennessee.....	1920	32,500 21	Texas.....	1914	27,000 21
Idaho.....	1919	32,600 21	Arkansas.....	1912	26,000 21
New Mexico.....	1918	32,000 21	Wyoming.....	1912	26,000 21
Mississippi.....	1917	32,000 21	Florida.....	1911	21,825 21
Arizona.....	1916	31,400 21	Utah.....	1911	21,825 21

British Empire (22 Capital Ships: total tonnage 580,450)

Name	Completed	Ton- Speed	Name	Completed	Ton- Speed
		nage Knots			nage Knots
Royal Sovereign.....	1916	25,750 23	Emperor of India.....	1914	25,000 21
Royal Oak.....	1916	25,750 23	Iron Duke.....	1914	25,000 21
Revenge.....	1916	25,750 23	Madborough.....	1914	25,000 21
Resolution.....	1916	25,750 23	Hood.....	1920	41,200 31
Ramillies.....	1917	25,750 23	Renown.....	1915	26,500 31
Malaya.....	1916	27,500 25	Repulse.....	1915	26,500 31
Vahant.....	1916	27,500 25	Tiger.....	1914	28,500 30
Barham.....	1915	27,500 25	Thunderer.....	1912	22,500 21
Queen Elizabeth.....	1915	27,500 25	King George V.....	1912	23,000 21
Warpite.....	1915	27,500 25	Ajax.....	1913	23,000 21
Bombay.....	1914	25,000 21	Centurion.....	1913	23,000 21

Japan (10 Capital Ships: total tonnage 301,320)

Name	Completed	Ton- Speed	Name	Completed	Ton- Speed
		nage Knots			nage Knots
Mutsu.....	1921	33,800 23	Fu-So.....	1915	30,600 22
Nagato.....	1920	33,800 23	Kirishima.....	1915	27,500 27
Huiga.....	1918	31,260 23	Haruna.....	1915	27,500 27
Ise.....	1917	31,260 23	Hyet.....	1914	27,500 27
Yamashiro.....	1917	30,600 22	Kongo.....	1913	27,500 27

Walter Bruce Howe—continued from page 131

Our security and influence for good depend on the maintenance of a Navy proportioned to our rank among the powers. There is no fear that we will exceed this measure, but faith in our country will not permit us to have less.

Dudley W. Knox—continued from page 133

hand and projected, is of great proportions; so great that within a few years her aggregate sea power will be immensely increased. Thus the principle of limitation, for which we made our stupendous sacrifices, has been effectively nullified. The pace has been set; such a pace as must soon defeat another cardinal object of the Conference—that of reducing the financial burden of armaments.

The only way in which the first Conference seems likely to become beneficial to this country, from the naval viewpoint, is through a second conference which will correct the defects of the existing naval treaty.

Next Month

to

THE CONGRESSIONAL DIGEST

The United States Postal Service

Steps in Its Development

How It is Organized and Maintained Today

Should It Be Self Supporting?

Subsidized as a Public Institution?

The Issue in the 68th Congress

President Coolidge's Veto and Recommendations

Should Increased Rates Provide for Salary Increases?

Pro and Con Discussion

The Congressional Digest

Published the Fourth Saturday of Every Month

**Munsey Building
\$5.00 a Year**

**Washington, D. C.
50c a copy**